PERKINS LIBRARY
Duke University

Rare Books

the Pope called for Poole, requiring power & Dorland
pay to this treaty for Englt, & writ to the L. to receive
him. But the L. ordered as the matter was when more
=ytable bulls were sent about the Bulls & briefs to be laid
hold of without opening them. & sent word to Poole if he
refused over like would send him & all yt owned him in a
præmunire. Pope Paul 4 ambitious, religious, foolish
& unmind. Pope claimed right to bring the kg of France had fol
the Pope & claimed right to bring the kg of France had fol
out Edith, annulling marriages without consent of parents
& requiring Churchmen to reside at their benefices, as
=basions on the first & authority.

1557. Calais wch the Englsh had kept 240 years was
lost also Guines wch had 1100 men. also Hammes. &
the French took Barth a little Island — the Channell
but it was retaken by a Fleming who defended, a friend
yt dyed aboard his ship might be buried on yt Island &
the French feared yt they had no armes about them
but did not look into the coffin wch was full of armes.
& when they thought the Soldiers were buying their
friends, they arose & fell upon & took all the French.
The Reformed say yt the taking of Calais was a Judg
=ment on the nation for persecuting the true Relig. But
the papists say it was because Heretiks had too much
liberty & connivance.

In all 284 this reign
A. 1558. 39 were burnt for Relig. 800 were burnt
& bodyed in prison, some long.

this year the Q. dyed aged 43. having reigned 5 yeares
The year the Pope set out a bull against sins all
common as Heretiks, declared yt such princes as fell
into heresy did thereby forfeit their rights, should any
Temporall Lordship. & any might seize on their dominions

Pole was a learned, humble, prudent, moderate man
but the L. being of unbounded, rigid, fierce, zealous
Papist, promoted the bloody counsels of Gardiner
& Bonner. & no wonder for Papist Bps at their
consecration take an oath to persecute Heretiks to
all their might.

The Chancellor acquainted the Lords & after
next day the death of Q. M. & yt the crown was
now descended on Q. Eliz: & yt they were resolved
to proclaim her. & the Proclamation was read,
with such regard & Acclamations & Joy as
made great noise & Tumult.

And yt their forsaken altars, were like to be turnd
into communion tables. the Clergy were hated for
their cruelty - yet the greater pt of the people
loved the Pomp of the old Ceremonies.

Sr Wm Cecil & Sr Nicholas Bacon were made privy
Councellors. he was father to the great Sr Francis Bacon
one of they chief glories of the English nation. these
two gave a high Character of Dr Parker as fittest for
the see of Canterbury, but he refused it, & used all
arguments he possibly could agt it, & stood out long.
but at last was consecrated by four bishops, & after
yt he consecrated the other Bps, wch confutes the
impudent contrivance, & fable of the nags head
ordination. . Sr N. Bacon was made Ld Keeper.

Jan: 25. 1559 a Plimt sat to whom Ld Bacon made
a long speech desiring they would examine the
former Rlgn without heat or partiall affection, avoiding
all reproaches & upbraidings, & settle things so, yt all might
agree in an uniformity of divine worship. then the
necessity of the present affairs made the Q. conclude
a peace wth France, on the best termes yt could be
obtained. . they revived all acts made agt the
Popes power in K. Hen: time. & enacted an oath for
acknowledgeing the Q. supreme governor, in all causes
& over all persons. & the Q. was impowered to give
commissions, for judging & reforming ecclesiasticall
matters - & the Commissrs were limited to judge a
nothing to be heresie, but wt was so by scripture,
or the first four generall councills. & from hence
was the High Commission Court founded.

A publick conference about Rlgn was appointed. the
Ps yt tho the worship in a known tongue had been
appointed in scripture, yet the Chh had power to
change it, as she changed the sabbath, & had appointed
the servant to be received fasting, tho it was insti=
=tuted after supper. & so to eat blood was forbid,
& a community of goods was set up by the Apostles;
yet the Chh allowd yt. vulgar tongues sd he, change
Daily - but Lattin is the same, & spread over many
countries - & yt the people might reap profit from
prayers they understood not, as well as absent persons
the Q. of Ethiopias Eunuch read tho he un=
=derstood him not; & Philip was sent to explain it.
the Reformers argued yt St Paul injoyned us to

to pray wth understanding yt so the unlearned might
pfy thereon. & forbid use of strange tongues, where there
was not an interpretor. & yt things so devoutly enjoyned
should not be indifferent, nor fall under the power of
the Chh. the Jews & all others had their worshipp in the
vulgar tongue.

The Ps & the faith of the Chh ought not to be examined
by a Synod of divines, & it gave too great a
reputation to the sects, to dispute wth them: & yt
would but harden them in their errors.

2. & her Councell deserved to be excommunicate for bidding them to argue agt the Catholick faith before the
unlearned multitude. For wn they were sent to the towne
Ps & the audience was prepossessed, & the controversie
was appointed only to make way for hanging them.

The Romish prayer was worse & more against scripture & Ps &
it was a nullity, & of the antiquity, authority & consent
of the Catholick Chh ought to be a rule. but Reformers
& every Chh had power to reform it, & felt wth they proved
from the epistles of St Paul to the particular Chhs. & looking
to the church of the former Chhs, & yt in the 3 first ages,
there were no generall Councils, but every Bp in his
Diocese, or some few Bps of round about together, or
a provincial Synod, or determined matters in controversie,
& the orthodox Bps, when Arianism had so overspread
the world & even the See of Rome was defiled wth it, & as
Hezekiah, & Josiah had reformed the clergy in their
time, so might & 2. by her own authority.

Some popish Bps & some Gentlemen, & all the nuns
went out of England, & the 2. enjoyed none of liberty
yt she did.

The 2. was still inclined to keep images in Chhs, but
the Ref. desired her to consider the 2d commandm. St. John
charged to beware of idols, & not only of worshipping
them. the book of wisdom calls them a snare for the fool
of the ignorant. the use of them, & purification, ends
in idolatry, & were not allowed in Chhs, till the 7th
Century. it bred great contests in the Eastern Empire
& made way for its ruin. this the 2. put them down.

2. E. declared of by saying many Chhs did not intend any
authority for ministring divine services, but only her
soveraignty over all persons, & yt no foreign power
was to be admitted, & forasmuch as some might
declare they took it in the sense

now the articles of the Ch were published. but where in K Ed: 6 articles, its ſd x when he aſterwards made his body immortall, but took not from it the nature of a body, for ſcripture ſays, he ſtill retaines a true humane body, wch muſt be always in one definite place, & cannot be parted into many, or all places at once, & x is to remain in heaven to the end of the world, & to come from thence to judge the quick & the dead. therfore the real, or corporall preſence of his fleſh & blood in the ſacrament is not to be believed. but the R. & Common Doctrine to unite the nation, left out this, & thought it enough to aſſert the ſpirituall preſence of the body of x was given & received in a ſpirituall manner, & of the means by wch it was received was faith.

1549. the bible was tranſlated. ſeverall books were given to ſeverall bps, who were ordered ſuch diviſions ſhould be called as were named in greek & Hebrew & by their aſſiſtance they were to tranſlate yt pt of it did to their ſhare, & to attend to the reconſideration of thoſe of were appointed to tranſlate the other pts. after every bp had thus gone the round of all it were employed, then it was approved off & in two or three yeares this important work was finiſhed.

their ſtill wanted the eſtabliſhing the power of the Ch to be eſtabliſhed in orthodoxall hands, & the taking it out of lay hands, who have uſurped the authority of the Ch, & the reaſons of it, chiefly a prepoſſeſſion to rebellion, & is now framed & diſguiſed. but indeed the reaſon ſhews it, not to put too much power into the clergies hands to excommunicate by's. & ſo to make them equall to the Pope. & ſo to impoſe on them, to overturn governments under pretence of Rly.

now. A. 1559. the reformation began in Scotland, the nobility & gentry were for it, but the Q. of Scots oppoſed it. & gathered her forces, & the Refs got 3000 men to either. wch made the Q. paſs an act of oblivion. but when they were diſguſted the Pope no promiſe ſaving, promiſes were not to be ſtrictly tyed. Officially to heretiks, it was no ſin to kill them, & then & there execute it as well as the gould. but the people did ſo univerſally riſe, yt the Q. was forct to retire to Dunbar caſtle, & long French rans over, to aſſiſt her, & more was to follow. but ſhe being but Q. Regent in the minority of K was depoſed & ſo turn'd over our boat.

Richard Baxter's

ANSWER

TO

Dr. EDWARD STILLINGFLEET's CHARGE of SEPARATION.

Containing

I. Some *QUERIES* necessary for the understanding of his *ACCUSATION*.

II. A Reply to his Letter which denyeth a Solution.

III. An Answer to his Printed SERMON.

Humbly tendred, I. To Himself; II. To the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor and the Court of Aldermen; III. To the Readers of his Accusation: the *Forum* where we are Accused.

Acts 15. 28. *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things.* Rom. 14. 1, 17, 18. *Him that is weak in the Faith receive, but not to doubtful Disputations. For the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. For he that in these things serveth Christ, is acceptable to God, and approved of men.*

Phil. 3. 16. *Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same Rule, let us mind the same things.*—15. *If in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you.*

LONDON, Printed for *Nevil Simmons*, at the Three Cocks at the *West-end* of S. *Paul*'s, and *Thomas Simmons*, at the Prince's Arms in *Ludgate-Street*, MDCLXXX.

then a new supply came from France, for yt
the had 4000 French, & by her having this forreign
force the whole nation united wt her, & raild in the
English, wt 2000 horse & 6000 foot; shortly after
the Lord, & appeare was rendered a confession
of faith was pound by knox, & by the Parliam ordor
was inforced amongst their acts. & the K of France
dying, their young K came ordr & gouernd so as
the nation was pleased to submit.
Affaires of the Q. were hard to take sometimes in England,
where it was yet held to vplow her to her throwne. But the
greatest plotts of the Papists — ags on the Q. E. life —
& the Pope thundring out his curses — made the comunitie in fer
that as long as yt party had hopes of her to succeed, the
Qs life was not safe, nor her gouernt secure.

3ly Fra: Walsingam sd. Q. E. had two meanings of
state. 1. not to force conscience. 2. not to let factious
practise to vnsettle & trouble the vse reserued, if
the obstinacy of recusants: although she did not vse
— with the seuere laws of her father; but vpon the Popes
— declaring her vnworthy of the Crowne — raised the Rebellion in the
north, she made laws agt him, forbidding
— Agnus Dei's or such like tokens sent from Rome. &
— when — the 20. yeare of her reigne, it appeared, yt the
— K of Spaine designed to inuade her dominions, & yt
— Papists had sent order from seminaries made on yt
— coast beyond sea, to corrupt her subjects, by wch bulls
— for was infused formerly in confessions. then the Q.
— inflicted pecuniary punishmt on such as came not to
— Ch & made laws more rigorous.
— The Puritans inueighed agt pluralities, non residents
— refused to comply wth ceremonies, & questioned the
— supremacy of Bps, declaring for a democracy in the
— Ch they affected popularity, & took occasions
— thereby, taking vpt of the alteration, the nation had to
— apprehend, yt they were in hazard of running from
— one extreme to another, setting up a new model
— of Ch discipline dangerous to the Queene & the
— crowne, & to the liberties of the people, yet those
— were borne with. yet afterwards wch they entred into
— combinations, & defamed the gouernt by ridiculous
— pasquils, & boasted of their number & strength, & broke
— out into tumults, wch was further & not zeal; then
— the Qu: saw it fit to restraine them & moderation

E
Tr. R.
B355A

THE PREFACE.

Readers,

I. *IF you would be truly informed of the Case of the Nonconformists, and the meaning of this Defence, you must know* 1. *That the meer Nonconformists of this age take not up their Judgment in trust from any party of men, and therefore take not themselves obliged to be* for *or* against *any thing, because men were so that were called Nonconformists heretofore: As the Scripture is their Rule and objective Religion, so they reverence the judgment of the Primitive Church above the judgment of any party; And indeed are so far against* Sects *and* Parties *as such, as that their judgment is that the Church will never be well restored to desireable Concord, till our Union be Catholick, upon the terms that Christ appointed, and which all good Christians have agreed in, and may agree in.*

2. *That what the meer Nonconformists of this age desired for Concord and Reformation, as to the old Liturgy and Conformity, is best known by their common Proposals* 1660, *all the Ministers of* London *being by Mr.* Calamy, *Mr.* Ash *and Dr.* Reynolds, *invited to* Sion-Colledg *freely to give their judgments: who offered nothing for Church-Government but Bishop* Usher's *Primitive form, and nothing for Worship but the Reforming of the Liturgy, and the free use of additional formes: Their exceptions against passages in the Liturgy being not thought absolutely necessary to Communion. And it must be remembred that they offered then,* 1. *A Defence of those Exceptions,* 2. *A Reformed Liturgy or Additions,* 3. *A Petition for Peace and preventing Schism, to the Bishops, which they never answered to this day, that we know of.*

3. *You must know that the Change of the Liturgy on pretense*

603503

of easing us, and the Act of Uniformity, have made Conformity now quite another thing than it was before, and to us far more intollerable; I am past doubt that Ri. Hooker, *Bish.* Bilson, *Bish.* Usher *and such others were they now alive would be Nonconformists; yea, I can prove it, as well as I can prove that they were honest men, and would hold to what they wrote.*

4. *You must know that we had never leave to give our Reasons against the New Conformity; nor allowed to be once heard speak for our selves, before about two thousand Ministers were silenced; when our Judicatures will hear a single Malefactor. We have been silent about eighteen years, while men have call'd to us* [What is it that you would have?] *while they would not give us leave to tell them.*

5. *And when the Press was somewhat open, they spread it abroad that* [our silence now plainly shewed that we had nothing to say, but kept up a Schism against our own Consciences.]

6. *At last, though my Friends had long told me that our* Lives *must be our best* Defence, *and that our* Accusers *would but be inflamed by an Apology, and could not endure to hear our Reasons, I durst forbear no longer, but yet ventured no farther than to write a bare Narrative of the* Matter of our Nonconformity, *lest arguing should exasperate: But that very naming of the things which we deny, hath much displeased them that differ from us, supposing that it implyeth an accusation of them, which I renounced.*

7. *The Reader then that will understand our Case, must not look to find it here, but be at the labour to read what is already written of it, which we must not repeat as oft as any will write against us; that is,* 1. *In the said unanswered writings of* 1661. 2. *In the Kings, Declaration concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs, for which the* London *Ministers subscribed and printed a Thanksgiving.* 3. *In my first Plea for Peace, describing our Nonconformity.* 4. *In the Defence of it against Mr.* Cheyny's *Answer.* 5. *In my second Plea for Peace, describing our Judgment of Government and Obedience, and what our Nonconformity is not, and divers other points.* 6. *In my* True and only way of Universal Concord,

cord, *on which the Churches must agree, if ever.* 7. *In my* Moral Prognostication. 8. *In my Abridgment of Church-History of Bishops and Councils, shewing what hath divided the Churches heretofore.*

8. *You must know that I write not to justifie every man that is called a Nonconformist, but to give an Answer to the publick Accusation of my self, and a Reason of the Preaching of the meer Nonconformists.*

9. *But that the fuller Justification of our Preaching is intended in another Treatise, called* Their Apology, or Third Plea for Peace.

II. *And as to the prosecution of the debate with this Reverend Doctor, it is not likely that I shall trouble him with any Rejoinder if he Reply, unless he will take another course, and first explain our terms, and state the question to be disputed. Much less shall I contend with any substitute who shall avoid the way of Love and Reason, which from the Doctor I may expect.*

There is one sort of Disputants that are too strong *for me,* Those that have a better Cause; *Truth will overcome: Light will appear through narrow cranies. Of these I shall be glad to be overcome: I protest, that to my knowledg, I never managed a Dispute, in which I trusted not to the Goodness of my Cause, more than to wit or words or humane advantage.*

But there are above twenty sorts of other Disputants, too hard for me to overcome.

1. *Those that will Dispute before they agree of the sense of their terms or state the question, and then quarrel for not being understood.*

2. *Those that will not read or answer our fullest Defence already written, but look I should still begin anew.* thus doth non Conf

3. *Universallists, that can prove me to be an Ass, because I am an Animal.*

4. *Equivocaters, that can prove me a* Separatist *because I sit not at their feet, or read not in their Book or with their Spectacles.* so doth

5. *A Pope that taketh it for a Heresie or Crime to question his word, or suppose him fallible.*

6. *A*

6. *A proud meer Grammarian, who can confute* Aristotle *and the School-men with a scorn, and taketh it for a disgrace to have any more Logick than simple terms; or taketh Rhetorick for the purest fruit of Reason.*

7. *A Nominal, who contracteth all his Syllogisms into simple terms of art, and can confute any Adversary, by calling him a Fool, or a Rogue, or a Heretick, or a Schismatick.*

8. *One that standeth so high that he thinks men below him to be little things like walking* Crows.

9. *A one-eyed man that can see nothing but on his own side.*

10. *A galled person that smarteth if the wind blow on him: And a melancholly man that thinketh that all that you think and say is against him, and would kill him.*

11. *I cannot dispute against* Canons and Organs, *that speak so loud that none can be heard but themselves. Nor against ringing Bells, that have loud tongues and no ears: and go on, on, on, and take no heed to what is answered.*

12. *Nor against such as* Isa. 48.4. *Iron is too stiff for me to bow, and I can make no impression upon brass.*

13. *Nor can I deal with such as are described,* Psal. 7. 4, 6, 7. *Such an Oven hath too wide a mouth and too hot a breath for me to contend with.*

14. *Nor such as* Psal 59. 7. *and* 55.21. *that speak* swords, *or dispute with hands and not with tongues: and fetch their arguments from the* Prison, *or the Lyons, and speak not to the ear, but to the flesh and bones. Nor such as* 2 Sam. 23.6. Isa. 27. 4. Mic. 7. 4. *Thorns and Bryers speak too feelingly. If I must dispute with stings, I had rather it were with Bees that will recompence me, than with Wasps or Hornets.*

15. *I am too weak for men over valient that can venture upon any thing, and easily prove that the Snow is black.*

16. *And my voice is too low for the dead and deaf and sleepy and drunken, that when I have spoken know not what I said.*

17. *I am loath to enter the Lists with those Women that never want time, or heat, or words, and seldom foul ones,* [Nam si cum stercore certo, vinco seu vincor, semper ego maculor.]

18. *Nor*

18. *Nor am I able to deal with a Crowd or Multitude, where they follow the Leader, and cry,* Away with him, *when few know whom or what they are againſt.*

19. *Nor yet with Lads that are too quick for me, and value* Mercury *above Gold, that have quick Trade but little ſtock, and think age and experience to be the Characters of dull declining Wits.*

20. *And I am too weak to diſpute a man out of Love with his Life, or his Pleaſure, Wealth or Honour. All Church-Hiſtory tells me how rarely any ever ſcrupled the Lawfulneſs of being made Pope or Patriarch, or hath been argued out of a Biſhoprick or Dominion. I am not ſtrong enough to anſwer an hundred pound a year, much leſs a thouſand (though Grace and Conſcience is.)*

21. *But though all this be not the Caſe of the Reverend Doctor, yet one advantage (though uncertain) he hath: He is like to* over-live me, *and ſo may have the* laſt word; *And that is a certain Victory with the ſequacious multitude. But yet Truth will triumph, and fraud will vaniſh, and ſecret things ſhall be brought to light, and that which is crookned by the Judgment of men ſhall be ſet ſtrait by the infallible final judgment.*

The Rump Comes of of the Rebellion
ghin[t] we now left after the forhundred
& Barebone (wn all of would not act a
they did) were turned out. Voted out th
hands of Ld, & of Supream authority
in the nation & people (as Swin
wth 200 Reg Sequestors) - the Presbyt
clergy abolished & sworn adherence
id — 1648-& 1649 tho'd was com
blank as the Covenant with they h
forbore 3 or 4 long before.

For the Reverend Doctor Stillingfleet, *Dean of St.* Pauls.

Reverend Sir,

AS you have told the Magistrates and the World what you think of me as guilty of sinful Separation, I have reason to hope that you will not deny me your help for my own conviction: For it concerneth no man so nearly to know my sin as my self: and being so near my day of Judgment, I were a most inexcusable wretch if I were unwilling to know it. You knew their capacity it's like, for whom you Preacht and wrote; but I, that best know my own, finding it impossible to understand you and your accusation without further help, presume to intreat your speedy Answer to these Questions, which are the stop of my Conviction.

I. Q. I entreat you to tell me more plainly, *which is the constitutive Regent part of a National Church?* Whether the King, or a Sacerdotal Head? For that you know, that a Church as well as a Kingdom, is essentiated by a *pars regens*, and *pars subdita*, I long ago found in your *Irenicon*. I have opened the state of the Question in my first *Plea, Page* 251, 252, &c. Of which I crave your Solution: For to hear of [*One Head,*] and not know who it is, is no satisfaction to me.

II. Q. I intreat you to tell me more plainly what the [*One Rule*] meant in your Text was, which was then extant, and all that had attained to be true Christians were then and are now to agree in and walk by. For I perceive you truly judge that it was somewhat then known to them; and yet in your application one would think you meant some late humane Laws.

Was it a Divine Rule or a Humane? If Humane, how to know it.

III. Q. I beseech you tell me plainly, what is the *definition* or *formal reason* of that sinful *Separation* which you mention as mine. For I cannot perceive it by your Book: unless you take *preaching without the Magistrates Leave*, and Worshiping in a manner different from that appointed by Law, and forbiden, to be it. But I suppose you take not all Disobedience to be Separation, nor all different Modes of Worship. I would fain know what you mean.

IV. Q. I intreat you tell me plainly, what you would have the many score thousands do on the Lords days, who cannot hear in the Parish Churches? For the matter of Fact is past dispute, that in your Parish of St. *Andrews, Sepulchres, Giles Criplegate, Giles in the Fields, Martins,*

tins, *Clements* and many others, there are in some 10000, in some 20000, in some 30000, in some, the Parishoners say, 60000 Inhabitants more than can come into the Church and hear the Ministers Voice; which seldom can be heard by more than 3000 or 4000. How would you have all these score thousands spend the Lords day?

V. Q. Are you not conscious that the true pastoral Office is not Performed in your own Parish to the third part of the people according to their need, and *Pauls* example *Act.* 20. by reason of the number of them? Prudent peaceable Men of your Parish tell me, that not one of five of their Neighbours ever use to go to any Church: And out of the Church never here a word from the Pastor, unless at the Baptizing of a Child: but live like Heathens without any Publick Worship of God: And the worst men that most need help least desire it, and therefore easilieſt take the excuse that at the Parish Church there is no room, and if they go to others they are called Saparatists; but not if they play, work or drink at home.

VI. Q. I am confident you know the need of many Curates in your own Parish; (for my Part, I profess, I am so far from thinking my self capable of a Bishops work, that I would not take many 1000. *l.* a Year to take the Pastoral Charge of your Parish without many Assistants (seeing that you and I) as I see by your Treat. of Satisfaction, and other Doctrinal Books) do Preach the same Doctrin, and I perform but the Part of a Curate or Assistant to you for nothing, Why think you that it is worse than that so many be untaught?

VII. Q. Do you not think that culpably to alienate an Ordained Minister, Vowed to the Sacred Office, is far worse sacriledge than to steal Church Plate or moneys And that it must needs be so culpable, either in our selves for not Conforming, or for ceasing our works, or else in those that hinder us.

VIII. Q. What then is it that you would have us do, when after our best endeavours we are no more able to see the Lawfulness of Conforming or forsaking our Calling, than of many great notorious sins?

IX. Q. Do you think that for qualification and number there are so many better than the silenced Ministers in the Land, as may so far supply the Peoples wants, as that 2000 such as we may better be spared, than employed, unless we can Conform?

X. Q. Are none of our Hearers more competent Judges then their Accusers, what profiteth their own Souls? And if they are, what is the great harm that such as I do that weighs down the Peoples profit? while all your Power is for edification, and all your Churches that I come in are full?

XI. Q. What is it in us that warranteth a humble Conformist to

think, that his Miniſterial duty is ſo much better than ours, that in compariſon of his Miniſtry, ours is unneceſſary and we unſufferable in the Land: Is it *ignorance* or our *wickedneſs* that makes the difference ſo great? I have ſtudied many years longer than you, though perhaps with leſs advantage: We know nothing in the world that we prefer before the pleaſing of God and edifying his Church? Though you excel us, do all others ſo? My meaning is, would you have none tolerated in *England* that are as *ignorant* and as *bad as I*, *Conſideratis conſiderandis*. Doth bare Conforming make all this difference?

XII. Q. And as I ask all theſe Queſtions for my ſelf (and earneſtly intreat your Anſwer) pardon me while in true love to you, I put this Queſtion to you for your ſelf; Whether doe you think, if you lived in the pain, and as near the Grave as I do, and by the ſentence of death had the lively apprehenſions of your account, ſhould you not tremble to think of becoming a Preacher againſt our preaching, and juſtifying or owning the ſilencing and ruining of ſo many hundred devoted Miniſters of Chriſt, who are no worſe, and for no worſe Cauſe? Such as truly deſire to ſerve God as faithfully and diligently as your ſelf, and with as little reſpect to preferment, riches, applauſe, or any worldly end? And whether you will never wiſh that you had never put your hand to ſuch a work, as to argue with the Magiſtrate and harden others againſt the enduring of ſuch Mens labours even on the hard terms that we willingly perform them.

Sir, Many importune me to publiſh an Anſwer to your Sermon: 1. As to my ſelf, I am more concerned to crave your help for my conviction, if I live in ſin at ſo dear a rate, even to my fleſh: 2. And as to you, you have deſerved ſo well of this Land, eſpecially for ſo ſtoutly oppoſing Popery at ſuch a time, and are ſo much loved and valued by us all, that I would take the leaſt provoking way, as knowing what contention and exaſperation tendeth to, and how glad the Papiſts will be to turn your Pen from themſelves, and leave you and ſuch as I together in a fruitleſs conflict: waiting your Anſwer, I reſt.

Your unworthy fellow-Servant,

May 26. 1680. Ri. Baxter.

Dr. Stillingfleet's *Answer to Mr.* Baxter's *Letter.*

SIR,

I *Lately received a Letter from you, wherein you complain of my exposing you to the Magistrates and the world, as one guilty of sinfull Separation, whereas I never mentioned your name when I Preached, and when I Printed the Sermon, I have quoted it several times against Seperation.* §. 1. §. 2. *But if your meaning be, that you think your self concerned in those practises which I charge with that guilt, I should have been very glad to have found in your Letter an Answer to those Reasons in my Sermon which moved me to judg as I then did, and still do concerning them, Which in my opinion had been a far more likely way for your Conviction, which you seem to desire in your Letter, than my Answering those Queries you propose; many of which do very little relate to the matter in debate between us, What you mean by knowing their capacity for whom I Preached and wrote, I am not willing to understand; but if I have any, the single Question between you and me, as to this matter, is, Whether the upholding Separate Meetings for Divine Worship, where the Doctrine established, and the substantial parts of Worship are acknowledged to be agreable to the Word of God, be a sinful separation, or not?* §. 3. §. 4. §. 6.

By seperate Meetings I mean such as pretend to a purer way of Worship, and are kept up in opposition to the legal establishment of Religion among us. And now Sir, I pray consider,

First, To what purpose I should resolve the Queries you make concerning our great Parishes, since, §. 7.

1. *The seperate Meetings are kept up in the City, and adjoyning Places, as* Hackny, Newington, &c. *without any regard to the greatness of Parishes, or capacity of Churches.* §. 8.

2. *You cannot but know, that the People do not go to them, because they cannot find room in Churches, but because they look upon the Worship of God as purer there, than in our Parochial Churches, and most of those who frequent them, would not come to the publick Worship, were our Churches never so great, or our Parishes never so small.* §. 9.

3. *The Preaching in them is forbidden by Law, which the greatness or smallness of our* Parishes *doth not make more or less lawful to be done; unless those who preach in them do Conform to the Laws established; and so I grant you, the Tabernacle in* St. Martin's *Parish, is now a help to the* §. 10

§. 11. *Parish-Church, which before was a separate Meeting. And I wonder a Person of your sagacity should think to satisfie your self, or others, by such slight evasions as these, which scarce any of my Auditors or Readers, how mean soever their capacities were, but could discern the weakness of them.*

§. 12. *Secondly, Others of your Queries relate to the Qualifications and number of the ejected Ministers, and comparing their Gifts with Ours.*

But what is all this to the business of Separation? unless you suppose that the Gospel is not preached by Us; or whether it be or not, that you are bound to preach it still, and so much seems to be implied in your 7th *Question,* viz. *That it is a Sacriledge culpably to alienate an Ordained Minister vowed to the sacred Office. And because this comes neerest to the matter in hand, and seems very much to stick with you, I shall desire you to resolve these Queries.*

1. *Whether it be not in the power of those who give Orders in a Christian Church to limit and suspend the Exercise of the Ministerial Function without Sacriledge? If not, how could the Christian Church in its best and purest times, pretend to reduce Bishops and Presbyters to a Lay-Communion? of which you may read so often in St.* Cyprian's *Epistles. Nay what Church is there to be named, that doth not assume this power to it self, without the least suspition of Sacriledge? And it would be very strange, that this Notion of Sacriledge should never be understood before.*

§. 13. 2. *Whether Christian Magistrates may not justly restrain those Ministers from Preaching, who, after the experience of former Troubles, do refuse to renounce those Principles which they judge do naturally tend to involve us again in the like Troubles?.*

3. *To what purpose any such Authority is either in Church or State, if those who are legally silenced may go on to preach publickly in opposition to the established Laws; only on supposition that they were wrongfully ejected?*

§. 14. *This I am certain is contrary to the Doctrine of all the Non-conformists of former times, as you may see in the Book published in their Name by Mr.* Rathband, *A. D.* 1644. *p.* 41. (*besides what you may find in my Sermon, p.* 51. *only the Testimony of Dr.* Gouge *ought to be corrected thus, p.* 513, 514.) *Their words are,* if a guiltless Person put out of his Charge by the Churches Authority, may yet continue in it, what proceedings can there be against guilty persons who in their own conceit are always guiltless, or will at least pretend so to be; seeing they also will be always ready to object against the Churches judgment, that they are called of God, and may not therefore give over the execution of their Ministry at the Will of Man.

§. 15. 4. *Whether there be the same obligation now lying upon Ministers to preach the Gospel, in a Nation where the Gospel is confessed to be truly preached, when they are forbidden to do it by the Laws of the Land; as there was upon the Apostles to preach it first to the World, notwithstanding the prohibitions of men?*

The

The disparity seems so obvious to me, that I could hardly believe men of understanding would alledge the Apostles words to justifie their present practises, had I not so often seen it done. But that the old Non-conformists did truly understand the disparity of the case, you may see it in 3 instances in the former Book, which I shall refer you to.

But you ask one materiall Question in behalf of the People, viz. *Are none* §. 16.
of our Hearers more competent Judges than their Accusers what profiteth their own Souls? And is this in your judgment, a tolerable Plea for Separation? Then there can be no such thing as an unjustifiable or sinful separation, since the People are left to be their own Judges. For where was any separation made but upon such a pretence? And upon this ground the people may leave you to morrow, and go to Doctor O. *and leave him next week, and go to the* Anabaptists, *and from them to the* Quakers; *and still plead that they are more competent Judges than their Accusers, what profiteth their own souls? No one would think by such Questions as these, that ever you had written so much against Separation, and spoken so freely of the mischief of it.* §. 17.
Thus I have pickt out those Queries, which come neerest to the matter of Separation, and given a sufficient Answer to them. But as to the other remaining, concerning the constituent regent part of a National Church; the One Rule mentioned by the Apostle; and whether you or I have studied longer. or to better purpose, I have in civility passed them over, as no more relating to §. 18.
our business, than determining the Principle of Individuation is, to the keeping of the sixth Commandment. And I am resolved in debates of this nature not to be drawn off by any by-Queries from the main thing in Controversie. I do not press you to any speedy Answer, but I desire you rather to weigh and consider things impartially, than to give too hasty a Reply. I am neither fond of Controversie, nor can I desert so just and clear a Cause as I take this against Sepparation to be; from which I shall not be moved by the noise and censures of weak and injudicious people, who I find (as you formerly observed) can least endure to be touched in this matter. If you please at your leasure to return an Answer to this paper, it shall be thankfully received by,

SIR,
Your faithful Friend
and Servant
EDWARD STILLINGFLEET.

My suddain removal into the Country upon the receipt of yours, must excuse my sending this no sooner.

A Reply to Dr. Stillingfleet's *Letter; being the Sum of our Controverſie.*

§. 1. I Confeſs I was ſo well aſſured of the Divine Obligations which lay on me, to do theſe things which you judge my ſin, that my expectations from your return were very low: But yet I thought it my duty to try whether you had more than I knew of to ſay for my Conviction, before I ventur'd on a Defence: But your refuſal to convince and ſatisfie me, increaſeth my confidence that it is my great Duty which you account my Sin.

§. 2. Did you not write to be underſtood? Or muſt *I only* not underſtand you; muſt I trouble the Reader by gathering all the paſſages, where you expreſly ſpeak to me, *viz.* As *One of them*; and as going *beyond the Independants*, and preaching *unlawfully* to them that *unlawfully* hear; and as dealing *more diſingeniouſly* and *leſs fairly* than the old Separatiſts, and ſo almoſt from end to end.

§. 3. Seeing you *ſhould have been very glad to have found an Anſwer to your Sermon*, an Anſwer you ſhall have.

§. 4. Seeing you will no further explain your great word [*Separation*] I will anſwer it where I find it in your Sermon: And if the Caſe muſt be no more intelligibly ſtated, I muſt take it as you will do it.

§. 5. To ſum up all, as far as I am able to underſtand you, your Sermon containeth, 1. The Grounds ſuppoſed on which you build. 2. Your Accuſation of us on thoſe grounds. 3. The *Penalties* which you juſtifie. 4. And the Cure which you deſire.

1. As far as you are intelligible to me, your ſuppoſed grounds are, that [*God hath authoriſed the Magiſtrate* 1. *To chooſe what Perſons every man in his dominions ſhall entruſt his ſoul to, as the Paſtor, whoſe Conduct he is bound in Conſcience to obey*: 2. And alſo to *chooſe and command in what words only every Paſtor ſhall publickly pray to God*; and what *Books and words of men he ſhall profeſs aſſent and conſent to*; and what *dedicating Symbols of Chriſtianity he ſhall uſe as engaging in the Chriſtian Covenant*, and to *command Ceremonies and Modes, for diſſent wherein he ſhall deny Baptiſm, and Church-Communion to all diſſenters, though the things be taken to be indifferent by the Magiſtrate, and great ſins by the Diſſenters.* 3. And that all that obey not in all theſe, but preach when forbidden, or uſe other accidents or modes, and chooſe other Paſtors to be their Guides, are Separatiſts and ſin againſt God.

II. On

II. On thefs grounds you judg me and fuch others finful Separatifts.

III. You juftifie the executing of the Laws upon us and would have us filenced, and fuch Diffenters not endured.

It is our (Conformity, or our) ceafing to Preach which you Plead for as the Cure.

§. 6. L As to your fuppofed ground, 1. You know, it's like, that in my firft *Plea for peace*, *I* largely confuted it: And could you think that without any reply your bare faying over the thing confuted, could be any fatiffaction, to one of any fenfe or confcience.

2. You cannot but know that the judgment and practice of the Univerfal Church in *Eaft* and *Weft* hath been againft you, not only for the firft 300 years but for many hundred after. Father *Paul Sarpi* after cited, in his Hiftory of Church Revenues truly teftifieth it: *I* have Proved it by many Canons and Hiftories in my Church Hiftory, that he was to be taken as no Bifhop that was chofen by Magiftrates, Prelates or any without the *Clergies Election*, and the *Peoples Election* or *Confent*: Chriftians then took not this to be any Part of the Princes truft: but only to countenance the things that furthered Learning and Godlynefs, and encourage the Clergy and People to choofe the beft, and to protect and encourage and Govern them by the fword when they were chofen. This being paft doubt, were the Univerfal Church Separatifts? *Is our Confent* with the Univerfal Church, or *your Singularity* from it, liker to Schifm or Separation?

3. *I* know that there are incoveniences in the Peoples confenting Power, and fo there are in all humane affairs? but not to be cured by Pernicious mifchiefs. You will not tell me, becaufe you cannot tell me, how we fhall know what Magiftrates they be that have this truft? Whether Heathens, *I*nfidels, Mahometans, Socinians, Arians, Macedonians, Eutchians, Monothelites, *I*mage-Worfhipers, Papifts, Anabaptifts, or who? and who muft judg of their qualifications? Yea, were we fure that the Prince were Orthodox, if he were but wicked, debauched, an enemy to ferious Practical Piety, as all wicked men naturally are inclined to be, will not all fuch choofe Bifhops and Paftors like themfelves? what more natural than to Propagate our like? And will not wicked Bifhops make wicked Prieffs; And you know the Patron hath the choice with us and it's a flender qualification which the Bifhops hath power ro require, without a *quare impedit*: An Atheift, a Fornicator, a *Ddrunkard*, a *Hater* of *holinefs*, *hath nevertheleſs* the choice of a Prieft for the Parifh, to whom all the People muft intruft their Souls. What a fad Cafe were the Chriftian World in, if we may lawfully have no other Paftors than Gentlemen and Princes chooſe for us? When Chrift tslls us how hard it is for the Rich to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven?

and

and how few of the Noble are called, and [*in uno annulo, &c.*] is become a Proverb. What a Case were *Hungary, Poland, France, Germany*, and the *Greek* Churches in, if this were true?

4. *Personal Power* in man is the first: *Family Power is the next*: City and Kingdom *Power* supposeth these and cannot destroy them: Hence subjects that are not meer Slaves, stand up to Plead for their *Personal* and *Domestick property, liberty and Power.* If my Money and Limbs and Life be not at the Patrons or the Princes will, much less my Soul. He is trusted with my Estate and Life; but I am first and more trusted with them. He may keep out ill Phisitians from the Land, and encourage the good; but he hath no power to tie me to an ill Physitian, nor to an ill Diet, nor to ill Servants, &c. The choice of these belongeth to my self; Much less can he on pretence of Parish-order tie me to an ignorant drunken, Maglignant, or an unexperienced sapless Teacher, that is to my Soul as a silly Emperick to my health. Scripture, the World, and Experience tell how much God morally giveth his light and grace, according to the apitude of means: *Habitus infusi se habent ad modum acquisitorum*, is common in the *Schools.* Twenty sinners are usally sooner brought to repentance under skilful fit Teachers, than under unskilful or ungodly Men. And no man hath Power from God to damn my Soul; or forbid me the needful means of my salvation. No man is so much concerned as my self what becometh of me for ever, and *I* will not beleive that the Patron loveth me and all the Parish better than we love our selves.

England hath been blest with better Rulers than other Lands: But one Rule must in this be held to by all the Churches. And if you would even here appeal to Experience, *I* will not here stay to tell you the names of 8 or 6 or 10 ignorant Readers, most Drunkards, some rarely, half never Preaching, that *I* was bred under, nor what a stock of such our Country had, and how very thin pious tolerable Preachers were: nor what worthy men *Aldermanbury, Black-fryers*, the *Inns-of-Courts*, and most places have had where the People chose.

But reason signifieth little with most, who are on his side that talketh to them with the best advantage: *I* insist on this, You go against all the ancient Fathers and Churches for many hundred Years, and are so far a Separatist from more than one Parish Priest.

II. And therefore your accusation of us thus grounded is Shismatical and unjust, and recoileth on your self, who instead of *Gods Rule* that *all should walk by*, accuse them that walk not by your novel crooked Rules, which may make as many Modish Religions as there are Princes.

III. And your desire of our *silencing* and not being *tolerated*, I will only here lament, and after speak to.

IV. And

IV. And as your Cure by our *Conformity* is impoſſible; ſo that by *silencing* will be none, but increaſe the diſeaſe.

§. 7. Isit not a very uncharitable thing of you, that when it's I whom you have called to account, you flatly deny or ſhun to give me an Anſwer to my Caſe, and to the Caſe of all others that preach only in Pariſhes where few of the People can hear in the Church. Why ask you [*To what purpoſe ſhould you reſolve thoſe Queries*?] I Anſwer, to ſhew me whether my preaching be my Sin, or Duty: And whether you juſtly, or unjuſtly accuſed me, and all ſuch others; was it not to this purpoſe that I craved your Anſwer.

2. And do you not know, that in the Bills of Mortality it appeareth that the Pariſhes within the Walls are but about the ſeventh part of the whole; and the outer Pariſhes, which are thus great, are about ſix parts: And in theſe Pariſhes it is not the tenth part in ſome, and the ſixth in moſt that can come within the Church to hear. And it is pity that one half, or two or three parts of ſuch a City as *London* ſhould be left like the *Indians* without any publick Teaching and Worſhip, and ſuch as you ſay ſotmuch for it.

§. 8. You ſay, *the Separate Meetings are kept in the City*, Hackney, Newington, *&c.*

Anſ. 1. What's that to me, and all ſuch other? 2. I can tell that ſome City Churches are yet unbuilt, and the Tabernacles will not hold the People (as Chriſt-Church, and others.) 3. And divers keep Meetings *within the Walls*, where they found moſt peace, for the *reception of thoſe without the Walls*, that cannot come into their own Churches. 4. What's done at *Newington* I know not; But at *Hackney* I know of two Meetings, where the Miniſters ſo preach out of the time of Publick Worſhip, that none may be hindred from going to it, and deny not Communion with the Pariſh-Churches, And they tell me, that as the Incumbent Officiateth by another, ſo the Pariſh is ſo great, and the preachers voice ſo low, that a great part cannot hear him.

5. Why do you ſay *they are ſeparate Meetings*, when you know that you have caſt them out: The Preachers had rather Preach in your Temples, and they cannot be ſuffered: Preachers and People that are profeſſed Nonconformiſts but in Opinion, are by the Canon *ipſo facto Excommunicate.*

§. 9. As to what you ſay of the Reaſon of their Meetings; I Anſwer, 1. I think (as far as I can Judge) the moſt of my Hearers, (I think ten or twenty to one) do alſo hear in the Pariſh-Churches: So that your Charge of Separation againſt them is but for hearing both: And I believe it is ſo with many others. 2. Every one that preferreth better, doth not ſeparate from all the reſt: Your Church alloweth any free Man to forſake and change his Biſhop and Pariſh Prieſt as oft as he will; ſo he will but

change his dwelling: And in *London*, Lodgers may change frequently. If *I* know those called Puritans better than you, *I* must profess that *I* believe of the two it is more the *Preacher* and his *Preaching* which maketh the difference with them than the *Liturgy*. For my part *I* seldom hear any but very good well studied Sermons in the Parish Churches in *London* where *I* have been; But most of them are more fitted to well-bred Schollars, or judicious Hearers, than to such as need more Practical Subjects, and a more plain familiar easie mode: And it is not your Reasoning that will bring all Appetites to the same Food; nor make the same Books serve every Form. I have alwaies found that such Conformable Preachers, as were Mr. *Bolton*, Mr. *Fenner*, Mr. *Whately*, Bishop *Usher*, &c. Were flockt after by those called *Puritans*, as much as the Non-conformists. But when they find all together, 1. That the Worship and the Preaching is more suitable to their good, 2. And that their Souls have need of much other Pastoral help than publick. 3. And doubt of the calling of obtruded men, no wonder if they prefer the other.

§. 10. But you lay the stress on the *Prohibition of the Law, which the greatness or smallness of the Parish doth not make more or less Lawful.*

Answ. God hath commanded all Christians ordinarily to Learn and Worship him under the Conduct of his Institution, all Christians grant this. No man hath Power to forbid this: All Law that forbiddeth it is of no Obligation. In a Parish where 10000, 20000, 40000, can not come within the Church to hear; if they have no other place to go to, they must forbear all publick Learning and Worship: So that the *English* of your Words is, that if the Law forbid the most of the People all Publick Learning and Worship of God, it is there as unlawful for any to Congregate against that Law as where there is no such need. But, 1. *I* again tell you, Councils, Doctors and the Universal Church thought otherwise, and abhor'd this Doctrine. 2. VVhy will you not give us one word of proof, but your naked Authority to prove such Authority in the Magistrate, and to satisfie us what Rulers have it, and how far it reacheth: Hath the King enabled Justices to depose him, or cast down his Honour or Prerogative? Hath God given Magistrates Authority to damn as many Souls as they will, by keeping them from the means of Knowledge, Faith and Holiness; and to forbid his Subjects to worship God? Did *Robert Grosthead* of *Lincoln* take this to be the greatest Sin save Antichrists, and do you take it for an Act Authoriz'd? *It* is unlawful to preach when forbidden, or worship God when forbidden, at *Japan*, *Idolatan*, *China*, *Turkie*, *France*, &c. or only in *England*? and where?

§. 11. Yet do you conclude ["*I* wonder a Person of our sagicity should "think to satisfie your self or others, by such slight Evasions as these, which "scarce any of my Auditors, or Readers how mean so ever their Capacities were, but could discern the weakness of them.

Answ.

Anſw. 1. O pity then the frailty of humane underſtanding! I get nothing by it if I err, but my great labour and the hazard of my Salvation by Sin! It muſt needs be then againſt my will; and is none of my ſize to be endured? How few Congregations are ſo happy as yours, if all your Auditors are ſo much wiſer? but, 1. Be the thouſands of your Pariſh as wiſe that *hear you not?* 2. How come ſome that I thought the wiſeſt that I know of your Auditors to ſay as I ſay, and lament your Caſe?

Reader, you ſee here that it muſt be ſomewhat better than the confidence of Teachers, that muſt guide and ſecure the Peoples Faith. This Reverend Man you ſee is moſt confident of the ſtrength of his Reaſons, and the ſlightneſs of mine: Aud I am ſo far paſt doubt on the other ſide, as that I think he overthroweth all Religion, and ſetteth up Man in open Rebellion againſt God: He may as well wonder that I take any thing to be of Divine command: If all publick Worſhip is ſinful, when forbidden, all Private may be ſo too. *Daniel* may go to the Lyons: The Martyrs, Fathers, Councils, the Univerſal Church are all fooliſher than the meaneſt of his Auditors. It's ſtrange that he can be ſure God's Word is true; and yet be ſo ſure that Mens Laws are above it, and may ſuſpend it; when yet Mens Laws have no more ſtrength than God's Laws gave them.

1. I believe that the Spirit of God hath ſaid, *Forſake not the Aſſembling of your ſelves together*; know them that labour among you, *and are over you in the Lord, and admoniſh you, and eſteem them very highly in Love for their work ſake*, 1 Theſſ. 5. 12, 13. That *have ſpoken to you the word of God, that watch for your Souls*, Heb. 13. 17, 24. How ſhall they hear without a Preacher, &c. *Rom.* 10.

2. I believe that where the Goſpel is hid, it is hid to them that are loſt: And without knowledge the Heart is not good, and without Faith there is no Salvation; and that it is Life Eternal to know God in Chriſt.

3. Therefore they that forbid Men to hear and worſhip God Publickly forbid what God commandeth; and what is ordinarily needful to Salvation.

4. I believe that God is Almighty, the higheſt Univerſal King, and we are all his Subjects; and the Scripture is his Law.

5. I believe that there is no Power but from him, and that he hath given none againſt him, or his Laws, nor above him; and that Man is not God; and that we muſt obey God rather than man, when they Contradict.

6. I believe that we muſt Love, Fear, and Serve God above all, and Worſhip him according to his Word, and Honour his Name, and keep Holy his Day whoever forbid it: And that we muſt Love our Neighbour as our ſelves, and help to ſave him as we may.

7. I believe that I muſt love my ſelf, and ſeek the ſaving of my Soul, though the Law forbad me.

8. I believe, that a Father must be honoured, and having care of his Childrens Life and Soul, he must command them necessary Food and Means for Body and Soul, and they must obey him, if the Law forbad it.

9. I believe that murdering Souls privatively or positively is a sin, as well as murdering Bodies, as many undertaking and not performing Pastors will find.

10. I believe that he that obeyeth not a Law which was made against Gods Law, or without Authority given by him, sinneth not against Authority.

11. I think in such cases, he that submitteth to the Penalty of a Penal Law, doth enough.

12. I conjecture, that the multitude of Casuists, Politick Writers, and Lawyers, [who say that *Because the Common Good is the End of Government, and all Power is for Edification, no Law obligeth which is against the Common Good, or at least that is destructive of it,*] are like to be near as knowing in such matter, as the *meanest* of the Doctors *Hearers* and *Readers.*

13. And I am past doubt, that he that denieth these Principles, will shortly have no cause to glory of his Wisdom.

And O what cause have we that are Teachers, in stead of proving those intollerable that differ from us in such matters as our Conformity to consider that an Errour in us, especially so Practical and momentous, is far more dangerous than in the People. If all my Neighbours mistake my Disease and the Remedy, it may not hurt me; but if my Physician mistake it, it may be my death. Bishop *Usher* and many Protestants do except a Learned Papist much more than the unlearned from the hopes of Salvation.

§. 12. I will readily Answer your Queries, though you refuse to Answer mine.

To your first, Those who rightfully give Orders, must give such Orders as God hath instituted, and may not limit or suspend contrary to his Institution or Laws. As he that marrieth Persons may not except the Husbands Power of Government, nor may unmarry them again, save for Adultery. None may silence Ministers that forfeit not their Office. On just cause to pull down Churches, and alienate the Church Goods, (as some Bishops of old did for the Poor) is no Sacriledge: nor to silence an intollerable Teacher: But to silence Ministers unjustly, is another matter.

If men will cant over still, *Who shall be Judge?* We still repeat, 1. Whoever is Judge, he hath no Power to cast out Faithful Ministers: and if he mis-judge them, it justifieth not his act. And every man is the *discerning Judge of his own Duty.*

§. 13. To your Second Query, Christian Magistrates may justly preserve the publick Peace by all just means, and may repress all Rebellious Practices and Principles: but if they should *mis-judge* any Principles to be such that are not, and for not renouncing those should silence Ministers, if they

they have fitter means than silencing to correct them; silencing them, when their Ministry is needful, is a sin.

But seeing these words are significant of your mind for silencing us, and the Reasons of it, why would you not tell me, what those Principles are which we refuse to renounce, and so deserve silencing. Either you lay the stress on the guiltiness of our Principles, or on the Magistrates judging them so. You cannot think, that if he mis-judge, it will justifie his silencing men: Else *Valens*, *Hunnerichus*, that cut out the Preachers Tongues, those that silenced the Preachers in *Germany* on one side for not swearing for the *Pope*, and on the other for not swearing for the Emperor, *&c.* all did well. Seeing then you speak as an Accuser of us, as guilty of refusing to renounce such Principles, and subscribe your implied consent to our silencing for it: O that you would be *so charitable* as to *help our Conversion*, and tell us *what those* Principles are. I have told the World at large my own and many other Principles of Government and Obedience in my second Plea for Peace: I crave your discovery of my Errors therein: Yea, I provoke also such as more fiercely accuse us as Plotters, or cherishing Principles of Rebellion, to name that Principle which I have not there renounced. If all that's there be not enough, I know not what will be enough.

§. 14. To your 3*d.* I answer, 1. It followeth not, That Authority to silence justly is to no purpose, unless all unjustly silencing must be obeyed: The Apostles, the old Bishops, the most of the Churches have disobeyed such as did the *Waldenses*, *Bohemians*, *German-Protestants*, the *French*, *Belgians*, *Remonstrants*, and *Contraremonstrants*, *&c.* You say greatness of Parishes makes no difference: What if the King turned all *London* into one Parish, and so forbid all Preaching and Publick Worship to all save a few thousands; Is Authority vain, unless all the rest turn like to *Athiests*? No good Christian should obey the Popes Interdicts of whole Kingdoms, though he had as much Authority as the King: A power to damn Souls is a frighfull word.

2. Either the supposition that is unjust, is true or false: If false, it will not justifie their Preaching: *If* true, either his preaching is necessary or unnecessary. If it be necessary, we must obey God, and disobey man (as *Grosthead* saith) by an obedient disobedience: *If* it be unnecessary, though the Magistrate sin, I must forbear there, and go to some place where I may preach without doing more hurt than good: So that all our Controversie lieth but in this, Whether the preaching of the 2000 silenced Minsters was unnecessary, and tended to do more hurt than good? And this is all that Mr. *Rathband*, or any sober Nonconformist meant: And this is plain truth, though the best of your Hearers, and Readers, or your Self, contradict it.

§. 15. And whereas you say, This I am certain is contrary to the Doctrine of all the Nonconformists of former times; your *Assertion* is so rash and *false* in matters of *notorious Fact*, that it weakneth my reverence of your Judgment

ment in matter of right. *I* have told you what Bishop *Bancroft* saith of the old Nonconformists forming Churches and Discipline: The Canon against Conventicles, thence occasioned, confuteth you: *I* have heard old Nonconformists preach constantly publickly and privately against Law: *I* was familiar with many of them: *I* never knew one of the mind you mention. Most of them did preach themselves that ever *I* heard of. *If* Mr. *Rathband* had denied this, it had been no proof. Mr. *Ash* that is one of them there, and Mr. *Slator*, both Preached at *Bremcham* long, Mr. *Pateman* at *Mosely*, *&c.* Multitudes I could name. And yet a man that knew them not [*is certain that all the Nonconformists of former times had contrary Doctrine.*] *I* was in 1638 and 1639 accounted one of them, though *I* used the Liturgie, which most of them did not. *I* knew them better than you did. *I* have named many in my first Plea, whose Practice proveth your great Error in that History where you say you are certain.

§. 16. To your fourth Question, An Obligation may be called [*the same,*] 1. *Quoad terminum.* 2. *Quoad gradum.* 3. *Quoad modum obligandi.* 4. *Quoad realitatem.*

1. The Apostles had an obligation to assert *Christs Resurrection, as eye-witnesses*, and to *record his Doctrine and Laws infallibly in Scripture*, and to many things proper to them, which we have not; But we are obliged to the work of our proper Office.

2. The Apostles had greater obligations than we, by more immediate Call, and special gift of the Spirit, and special Commission and Commands when ours are lower, but firmly binding us.

3. The Apostles were obliged by *Christs immediate Mission*, and *Commission*; and we but by his *ordinary instituted means*. But we are as truly bound to our Duty, as they to theirs.

2. And our Duty is to preach the Gospel to those without, and those within, according to our Power and opportunity, and to do the rest of our Office when we can. And though we are called to this without supernatural Inspiration, Vision, or Miracle; *being called*, we are as truly obliged as Parents, Husbands, Princes are to their Duties. It is not lawful to look back when we have put our hands to *Christs* Plow, nor perfidiously to break our Ordination Vow, nor to be negligent or treacherous Non-residents, Pluralists, slothful, nor to obey men more than God, though we were not called immediately, or by miracle.

3. If the Magistrate appoint 20000 or 1000, or one half a Parish to be excluded for want of Room and Teachers, it's ill supposed that the *Gospel* is *truly and sufficiently preached to them*, to whom it is not preached at all. And that it is preached to others, proveth it not unnecessary to them.

4. He that only *readeth the Gospel truly preacheth it*: But Souls have need of more Pastoral help than bare *true preaching*.

5. *I*gnorant wicked men in *England* can no more be saved than Heathens, and

and have need of convincing, skilful ſerious Preaching as well as they.

Your wondring at our allegation of the Apoſtle's words, and great confidence in ſo ſad a Cauſe, ſets me almoſt above wondring at any thing that you ſay. *Timothy* was not called immediately by *Chriſt*, who had that dreadful Charge to preach *in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon*. The Univerſal Church long judged otherwiſe of this caſe than you do: And not only Biſhop *Bilſon*, but *I* think almoſt all Chriſtion Writers, Proteſtants and Papiſts, herein follow the ancient Church againſt you. The Nonconformiſts and others eaſily grant what *I* ſaid before, That no *one Apoſtle might be ſilenced* by man; but *deſerving Miniſters, that do more hurt than good by their Miniſtry*, may be ſilenced by Chriſtian Magiſtrates: But not the Churches Edification oppugned, and 2000 faithful men ſilenced for not ſinning on pretence of a power to judg or execute.

§. 17 My Queſtion implieth, 1. That every man is moſt concerned for his own Soul, and hath a *prior* obligation to ſecure it, which the King cannot diſpenſe with. 2. And, That every man hath nearer helps to know what is good or hurtful to his Soul in doubtful Caſes, than the King that never ſaw him hath. 3. And every man is like to love himſelf more than the King loveth him. 4. And that the King can no more bind him to hurt, or famiſh, or endanger his Soul than his Health in Diet.

But the King muſt give men all the helps that he can: and ſet up and maintaine ſufficient publick Teachers, and drive the ignorant and profane to hear and learn, and promote Order and Concord, and hinder Unpeaceableneſs and Diſorder by juſt means. But *I* have ſo fully declared the Magiſtrate's Work in my Book of Concord, that *I* will not repeat it on this ſlight occaſion. Separations muſt be prevented by right means. *I* had no Seperatiſt in a great Congregation for fourteen years, though many Sects ſtrongly and often tempted them; no not one Seperate meeting all that time, and this without force. What harm will it do me, or them, if my Hearers go from me (as you ſay) to Dr. *O*? Our whole Country where *I* lived almoſt kept Concord and kept out Separtion without the Magiſtrates conſtraint: Experience is not eaſily confuted. Why then do you tell me of *what I have written againſt Separation*? when you may ſee that I contradict none of this; and when that *writing*, with my other Endeavours, ſerved without the Rulers Sword. *I* had three Juſtices always at hand that would have done for me what they could at any time: *I* never deſired one act of force from them. *I* allowed Quakers and Anabaptiſts Publick Diſputes half a day together: They never won one Man or Woman by it. Mr. *Tombes* his great Parts, and *Intereſt* with his Flock and Kindred, could get but about twenty four, or leſs then thirty Anabaptiſts at *Bewdely*; almoſt all the reſt of the Country was free, ſave a few inconſiderable Quakers at *Worceſter*, and a ſmall Village or two. The like was then done without force in many other Counties.

§. 18. *I*

§. 18. I told you how *neceſſary* the reſolving of the *Queſtions* which I ſent you was to my *Conviction*: And I will *not* provoke you, by giving that Name to *your denyal of an Anſwer to them*, which I think *impartial Readers* will give it.

I. Will other men believe that he doth well to deny me the *Definition of* that *National Church* which he writeth of, or to tell me *whether he ſpeak of a Lay or a Clergie Goverment*, who writes his *wonder* that I ſhould ſay, *I know not what they mean by the National Church?* How can I know whom to *obey*, or when I ſeparate from the Form of Government, if I know not what it is? Is this nothing to our Caſe? I take my ſelf to be more bound to obey the King, than ſome *Biſhops*, You knew that you are here devided as for two Church-Forms among your ſelves.

II. Would any man that ever knew you have believed that ever you, *even you*, ſhould have ſo *Preached* and *written* for walking by the ſame Rule, and accuſed the *Nonconformiſts* as worthy of ſilencing and as intollerable for *ſwarving* from that *Rule*, and when you have done, will by no intreaty be prevailed with ſo much as to tell me *what that Rule is*, *Divine* or *Humane*, the *Statutes* or the *Canons*, or what? yea, and think this impertinent to the buſineſs?

III. Was it not almoſt incredible, that when all this was ſaid and *written* againſt our *Separation*, that I cannot intreat you to tell me what *Separation is*, even what is the formal *Reaſon* from whence you ſo name it, and whether you make it not to be the ſame with [*Diſobedience*], contrary to *the common Sence* of Church Writers?

III. Is it not hard to have been believed, that when I and others are ſo loudly accuſed of *Preaching* (though I never gathered a *Church*) to ſome of many thouſands that cannot come into the *Temples*, (many of which never heard a *Sermon* of many years) that I cannot intreat you to tell me what all thoſe thouſands ſhould do on the Lords day, and how you would have them ſpend the time: And that this ſhould be taken as *impertinent*: The *Canon* commandeth the ſpending of the *Sunday* and *Holidays* in hearing *Gods Word*, &c. Doth he keep this better that goeth to no *Church*, or he that heareth ſuch as I?

Let the Reader alſo peruſe the reſt, and ſee whether they are *impertinent*.

§. 19. Before you deſired me I have long *weighed* with my moſt ſerious and *impartial* thoughts, the matter of this *Controverſie*: And I had great *Reaſon* ſo to do, when for the *labour* which you account my ſin, I wear my *Health* and *Fleſh*, I ſuffer *reproach*, and many a thouſand Pounds Loſs and Dammage, in theſe *nineteen years*; and being weary of a burdenſome Body, do bear it and live *eſpecially* for that *Work*. And if I do and ſuffer all this for ſin, to the wrong of the Church, and the hazard of my Soul, alas, what a caſe am *I* in! when no Study, no Prayer, no reſolved contempt

tempt of all Mens cenſure, and of worldly Intereſts, in twenty years time, yea in *forty one*, (for ſo long I have been partly a Nonconformiſt) can change my Judgment, or make me doubt? Lord, ſhew me thy Truth, and make me true to it, whatever it coſt me; and teach us all to know what manner of Spirit we are of, and acquaint us with the true way of Chriſtian Piety, Love, and Peace. *June* 17. 1680.

To the Reverend Dr. Edward Stillingfleet, *Dean of* St. Pauls, *&c.*

Richard Baxter *returneth this Account of his Doctrine and Practice, which by his publiſhed Sermon, preached before the Lord Mayor*, May 2. 1680. *he often calleth me to; and the Lord Mayor's and Court of Aldermen's earneſt deſire of his printing it, add to my Obligation.*

§. 1. SIR, I apprehend much reaſon for my rendring you this following Account, and ſome againſt it: And it was not eaſy to me quickly to reſolve which did preponderate. It is eaſy to foreſee, that the Papiſts will be glad that your Pen be turned from them, againſt thoſe whom they are moſt againſt, and will laugh to ſee you diverted by ſuch a Scuffle. And Satan, knowing our frailty, will hope to perſuade you, that all that is ſaid againſt the weakneſs and error of your Writings, is againſt your *Intereſt* and *You*, and ſo to ſtir up in you Paſſions and Thoughts directly contrary to Love and Concord, and your own and the Publick Good: For with ſome he hath unhappily ſucceeded to carry them from one Error to another, till he hath brought them to the bitter hatred of their Confuters. And though I am not ſo conſiderable as you, the Tempter diſdaineth not ſo low a Game, as to try whether he can make your erroneous oppoſition a ſnare to me. When I ſaw that you had begun this contentious way, it was eaſy to foreſee that Satan's Cauſe was like to gain by it, and therefore I fear that he was much the cauſe.

§. 2. And I remembred *Prov.* 17. 14. *The beginning of Strife is as when one letteth out Water; therefore leave off Contention before it be meddled with.* And if you could not forbear beginning, you will hardly forbear when a neceſſary Confutation ſeemeth to diſhonour you *Intereſt*, you tell me, *is ſtrong*; and it is eaſier to ſpeak againſt ſelfiſh Partiality than to overcome it. I never perſonally provoked you, unleſs it was by confuting your Opinion, [*That no Form of Church-Government is of Divine Inſtitution*] in my *Chriſtian Directory*: But as I named you not unleſs with honour, ſo your own accuſing of that *Irenicon* of yours, (otherwiſe a very laudable Book) doth ſeem to juſtify what I ſaid

§. 3. And I truly fear, leſt the opening of your Miſdoings ſhould rejoyce the Papiſts, and encourage them to ſay, *This is the Champion againſt the Catholicks*,

licks. For I speak from my heart in my usual saying to them that mention you, That this Kingdom is greatly beholden to you, for your seasonable and open defence of the Protestant Cause, at a time when ——— And I am glad that you blame them that accuse the Conformable Clergy of yeildingness to *Popery*; which implieth, that no Bribe shall tempt you, directly or indirectly to serve that Cause, how strongly soever it shall seem supported by the Arm of Flesh.

§. 4. But yet in so publick a Cause, to be by your Accusations so loudly called to be accountable for my Doctrine and Practice, and that to the Magistrate, and to an End easily discernable; and to refuse to tender you or the Magistrate any just satisfaction, when refusing may make me and thousands more taken for *Guilty*, as by our (silent) Confession, and consequently the Magistrate and you to incur a far greater Guilt, if you should mistake, this seemeth to me a Crime not to be ventured on. When you have made Answering necessary, I must answer: Else I should have imitated *Melanthon*, who oft boasteth how much he had profited in Philosophy, so that he could silently let *Illiricus*, *Osiander*, and such others write and talk against him. If possible, and as much as in us lieth, we should live peaceably with all Men; but when that which Men make impossible to us is no Duty, nor the want of it a Sin, though an Affliction, the Aggressor doth make Defence a Duty. And indeed I must be guilty of Scandal against you and others, if I deny you satisfaction. Either I or you live in no small Sin: Though Mr. *Cheney* think otherwise, your words, and many such others, shew, that you take our Course to be a Sin intolerable. And if it should prove that the Sin is yours, it could not be small, not only to do what we fear would be so bad in us, but also to accuse us so publickly to Magistrates, for not forbearing to preach the Gospel when we were solemnly devoted to it; and pleading against the toleration of it, when Non-toleration must be by Imprisonment, Banishment, or Death, or such Disablement, against such as believe they are bound to preach while they are able.

§. 5. Yet you can tell that they are *ill Men* that *reported you stir up Magistrates to Persecution*. If that much will prove it, it's like they will be emboldened to call you [*an ill Man*] too; for such faults are so common, that we may say as *Seneca*, [*Quid ulcus leviter tangam omnes mali sumus.*] Indeed they do not well that use that word, *Persecution*; when your words are but against *Toleration*, and the *Church of* England's *endeavour after Uniformity*; which are publickly known.

§. 6. And no wonder if they are *ill Men*; when you are but *finding out a certain Foundation for a lasting Union, which is impossible to be attained, till Men are convinced of the evil and danger of the present Separation*, &c. That is, you are but proving our Union impossible; for I have elsewhere proved, that the Conviction which you speak of is morally impossible, to become the

the terms of a common Union. It is impossible that we should all be convinced that none of the Particulars imposed are sinful, which I have named in my first Plea. And secondly, 'tis as impossible that we should all be convinced, that it is any more lawful for us to forsake our Ministry, to which we were vowed in our Ordination, than to break our Oath of Allegiance, and deny our Duty to the King. So that you do no worse, than for Union, to prove our Union impossible: and who is it that makes it so?

§. 7. And this Impossibility you infer from this Principle, [*That it is lawful to separate on a pretence of greater Purity, where there is an agreement in Doctrine, and the substantial parts of Worship.*]

Answ. 1. Was there not this Agreement in the case of *Cyprian* and the Council, who persuaded the People to separate from *Martial* and *Basilides?* And is not Union possible with such as *Cyprian* and the *Carthage*-Bishops?

2. We that are accused by you do not say that [*we differ not from you in Doctrine absolutely*:] *viz.* in the Doctrine about *Diocesan Church-Forms*, or their *imposing Power*, we never denied this difference. But we say, [*in the Doctrine of the 39 Articles,*] as distinct from the Form of Government, and imposed Abuses, we agree. And suppose that we agreed in such Doctrine and Worship with a Church, that yet held, only that the *Pope is* jure divino *the Constitutive Vicarious Head of the Universal Church,* and would take none that confess it not, for Christians; were it a Sin to separate from that Church?

3. Suppose that Usurpers should thrust out the Bishops and you, and make themselves our Pastors against our wills, is it unlawful to separate from them, though they agree with us in Doctrine and Worship? And if the Churches and Councils have been in the right, which for 700 yea 1000 years held that the calling of a Bishop was null that had not the Clergies Election, and the Peoples Election or Consent. I need not tell you how far this will reach.

4. What if a Church that you agree with in Doctrine and Worship will not receive you, unless you will deliberately profess or subscribe an Untruth, or covenant against some Duty, or commit a known Sin; is it intolerable for you rather to separate from them than to sin? And must we have no Union till we can in all things think as you do?

§. 8. I think you need not expect the Censures of the chief *makers of our Divisions*: And as to the *inferiour Sectaries*, if you are a *Sacrifice*, it will be an *unbloody* one. You well admonish us in the end, not to complain too much when we are silenc'd, impoverished, and imprisoned: The counsel is good; But for the Dean of *Pauls*, *&c.* that is deservedly loved and honoured by us all whom you thus deal with, and by those great Men whose esteem he deservedly more valueth, while he liveth in this Plenty and Honour, to call himself [*a Sacrifice*] if a few poor Men say, *He wrongeth them*, when he plead-

eth against the Magistrates enduring them, or against their Judgment that think they should be endured, Doth not this seem to another greater tendency, than for me only to say *de facto*, *I was laid in the Common Gaol, and fain to make away my Goods and Library to save them from Distress?*] But so much to your Epistle: The Sermon followeth.

§. 9. And what could a Man have desired more to end the main differences among us, than the serious consideration of your Text in its very plain import and drift.

1. That the Text speaketh for Unity and Concord is past question. 2. And that it speaketh both to the Pastors and the Flocks. 3. And that it speaketh to *all Christians*, though of various degrees of Attainment: And therefore requireth all to live in Concord that are Christians; notwithstanding other differences. 4. All the doubt is, what is meant by the same *Canon or Rule?* And there are these several Expositions pleaded for.

1. That by *the same Rule* is meant only the General Concord, *idem velle & nolle*; to agree, and live in *Peace*, and *to mind the same things.*

2. That by the *same Rule* is meant the Essentials of Christianity received by all Christians; which they should have concordantly practised, notwithstanding other differences.

3. That by the *same Rule* is meant the Doctrine which the Apostles had concordantly delivered to all the Churches.

4. That it was the Churches Creed which is supposed then to be in use, as the Symbol of Christians.

5. That it is the Canonical Scriptures, in the times that they were written and delivered to the Churches.

6. That it is the Example of S. *Paul* before described, or the matter of it; that is, to hold fast what he had attained, and press forwards towards the heavenly perfection, by desire, hope, diligence, and patience.

7. Some take the [*one Rule*] to be [*the end* as it is to be attained by the *means*;] that is, the *common good* of the *Church*, and furtherance of the Gospel and our Salvation: *Let all be done to edification.*

8. Some say, that it is the great Duty of Love which is made the Rule for our undetermined actions; or, that the fundamental duties are made a Canon to the Superstructures, as it seemeth to be meant, *Gal.* 6. 15, 16. And by Christ, *Go learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not Sacrifice.* To tell you *which* and *how many* of these I take to be meant in the Text, and *why*, is none of the work which you call me to; but to tell you, that which-ever of these it is, or if all these, we fully consent: All these Canons we must all walk by.

9. But some say, that by the *same Rule* is meant the *Tradition* and *Custom* of the *Universal Church.*

10. And

10. And some, that it is the Canons of the Bishops in General Councils; and under them, in National or Provincial Councils.

11. And some tell us, that the Rule of Christian concord is [*Obedience to the Bishops of all the World* (or Universal Church) *who are a College Governing* (not only *divisim & per partes*, in their several Precincts, but) unitedly as *One* Regent College, ordinarily *per literas formas*, and by General Councils when they sit.

12. And some tell us, that it is the Law or Will of the Civil Christian Magistrate which is this Rule.

As to these four last Rules we must put in our Exceptions. As to the *9th*, the Traditions and Customs then in use were Apostolical Institutions, and so are coincident with some of the former: But other Traditions and Customs we take not for this Rule.

And as to the tenth, we give Councils, though wrongfully called *General*, their due honour; as we do to inferiour Councils, and every particular Pastor in his place: but take not this for the Rule here mentioned.

And as to the 11th, we know of no such Government in being.

And as to the 12th, it was not then existent, and therefore could not be that meant in the Text: But we take our selves bound to obey Magistrates, as we have elsewhere at large explained and professed.

In short, either you think it is a *Divine* or a *Humane Rule* or *Law* which is here meant, or both: If a *Divine*, we shall not differ from you of any thing, unless it be of the meaning of it. If a *Humane*, either it is an act of true Power received from God, or not: If not, you will grant us that it obligeth us not as this Rule in question: If yea, then we agree that we are to obey it: So that all that will be useful to our Conviction will be, 1. That you prove the Persons authorized to their Office (and of our Magistrates there is no doubt) 2. And that they have authority to make all the Canons and Laws, which you call the Rule. And without this your labour is all lost to us.

§. 10. But which of all these it is that you take for the Rule meant in your Text, we must conjecture: 1. You well say, *p.* 11. [*It was such a Rule which they very well knew, which they had given them before.*] Therefore it was none that was not then in being, but to be made by Bishops afterward. And, *p.* 14. you seem to include the Canon made *Acts* 15. whatever the sense of this Text is, we willingly also stand to that; and to the Holy Ghosts decision, that nothing be imposed but *necessary things*: And, *p.* 15. I find you say [*that the preserving the Peace of the Church, and preventing Separation, was the great measure according to which the Apostle gave his directions.*] And this is all that I can find of your determination *what is that Rule.* And if *Peace* be the Rule, we all agree with you in declaiming against the violation of it. But is there no more in your Application?

§. 11. I remember it is said in the Life of *Joh. Bugenhagius Pomeranus* (the

Pastor of the Church in *Wittenberge*, and the Presbyter that ordained the Bishops and Presbyters of *Denmark*, and many other places) how much *John Frederick* the Elector of *Saxony* was pleased to hear him open the Reasons why Magistrates have power to make Laws, but not Pastors [*armatum esse potestatem politicam authoritate condendi leges, non pugnantes cum Decalogo; & de his traditam se verissimum præceptum; necesse est obedire propter conscientiam: sed pastoribus expresse prohiberi condere proprias leges, cum dicatur, Nemo vos arguat in cibo, in potu nec posse hanc libertatem ullius creaturæ authoritate tolli.*] But I had rather stretch my Obedience to the utmost consistent with Conscience and Obedience to God, than speak for any needless Liberty.

§. 12. It is certain, that by [*the same Rule*] is not meant, 1. Any Rule that tied Christians to subscribe or declare that there is nothing in our three Books, (Liturgy, Ordination, and Articles) contrary to the Word of God: For none of them were then extant, nor are they 200 years old. 2. Nor any Rule that tied them to any one humane Liturgy which all the Churches in the Nation must agree in: For there was none such. 3. Nor was it any Rule that imposed on them any dubious unnecessary Opinions, Covenants, or Practices; nor, in a word, our *Conformity*, or any like it.

This is easily proved: 1. Because the Rule which they were all to walk by, was somewhat then existent. 2. It was a Divine Rule. 3. It was that which all Christians were to have concord in: But experience telleth us, that all *Christians* (that is, that consent to the Essentials of Christianity) never had, nor can have their Concord in any of the fore-mentioned Conformity, as I have proved in my Book of Concord.

§. 13. We will go therefore no further than your Text for the Terms of our Agreement, and for our Defence against your Accusation: *Whatever you will prove to us*, by any such evidence as should *convince a Man of reason and impartiality, to have been THE RULE which the Apostle did here mean*, and bid all that are Christians walk by, *we earnestly desire to agree thereto:* And we will joyn with you against any that refuse it. It will be a way more congruous to your Function, and cheaper to your Consciences, to condescend to these Terms, and prove to us what this *same Rule* was, than to tell the Magistrates that it is no sin not to endure us.

§. 14. *Pag.* 16, 17, 18, 19. you come to tell us what Separation it is not which you speak of; *viz. not of the Separation or distinct Communion of whole Churches from each other, &c. Answ.* You know it's like your self what you mean by these words; if you would have us know it, I must crave your Answer to these Questions.

Qu. 1. *Do you make* Separation *and* distinct Communion *the same thing, or divers?*

Qu. 2. *What distinction of Communion is it that you mean? When there are so many things which may distinguish? 1. Communion in distinct places you take not for*

for Separation. 2. *Nor Communion under distinct Presbyters or Bishops.* 3. *Therefore I suppose neither under distinct Princes, or Aristocracies in Cities, as such.* 4. *Nor under distinct Laws (meerly as such) of the same Prince.* 5. *Nor distinct in allowed or indifferent accidents. Why any of these should be called* Separation *I know not, unless as the word doth signifie but Diversity or Distance.*

Q. 3. *Do you take Separation here in the same sence as before and after; or Equivocally? If Equivocally, why did you not tell us what you here meant; besides the difference of Subjects: If univocally, then*

Q. 4. *Is not the Separation of whole Churches much worse than of single Persons from one Church, when it is upon unwarrantable cause or reasons? If one Church unjustly renounce Communion with another whole Church, as no true Church, or as Heretical; I think that it is done by a* whole Church *against a* whole Church, *makes it worse.*

But perhaps you mean, that for two National Churches to have two Kings is not unlawful. No doubt of that: But to what purpose is it? Or is it that two National Churches may have different Accidents of Worship or Discipline? And so may two *Diocesan* or Parish-Churches in our Nation, if the King please at least.

§. 15. You add: *Which according to the Scripture, Antiquity, and Reason, have a just Right and Power to govern and reform themselves. Ans.* Have not all *Diocesan* Churches power to govern and reform themselves?

Government is of various species: Only the King, or *Summa Potestas Civilis*, hath Power to govern and reform by his *Species* of Government: But every Bishop may govern and reform his Church, as a Bishop; as every Master may his Family as a Master, and every Man himself as a Man. It's a strange Man, Family, or Church, that hath not power to govern and reform it self, though not Regal Power. Though Kings have Power, they have not God's Power; and all Power that is *Humane*, is not *Regal.*

§. 16. Serm. [*By whole Churches I mean the Churches of such Nations, which upon the decay of the Roman Empire resumed their Right of Government to themselves, and upon their owning Christianity, incorporated into one Christian Society, under the same common Ties and Rules of Order and Government.*]

Ans. 1. And had not those as good right that were not under the *Roman* Empire? (as *Abasia, &c.*) 2. Did the Churches under the *Roman* Power exercise their great diversity in Liturgies and other accidents of Worship without right? Had not they a right to govern and reform themselves variously as they did? 3. *Christian Societies* are of divers *species*: Do you mean Christian Civil Societies, Kingdoms, free Cities, *&c.* or Churches? Or do you take a Christian Kingdom and a Christian Church for the same, as the *Erastians* do? If so, I suppose half the Conformists will be against you, as well as I. At least you must confess, that if *de nomine* a Christian Kingdom *quasi tale* may be called a Church, it is equivocally; and that there is a sort of

Christian

Christian Churches which are of another Constitution. Far were the Christian Bishops for 1300 years from believing that a Prince or Civil Power was essential to a Christian Church, or that a Church in the common sence was not constituted of another sort of Regent part, that had the Power of the Keyes. Two *species* of Governours make two *species* of the Societies, if they are not subordinate, but prime constitutive Parts: But the Prince and the Pastor are two *species*, well opened among many by Bishop *Bilson* of Subjection. And verily if you Conformists be divided among your selves about the very Constitutive Rector of a Christian Church, you differ more from each other than we do from the generality of you. 4. And what be the *common Tyes* and *Rules* of *Order* which you mean? Are these notifying Terms for a Definition? 1. There are divine unalterable Rules of Order and Government, and there are humane Rules about alterable Accidents. 2. There are Rules made by Contract (such as *Grotius* thinks Canons are), and Rules made by Governours, which are binding Commands or Laws. 3. There are Rules made by Civil Governours to be enforced by the Sword, and Rules made only by Ecclesiastical Pastors to be executed only by the Power of the *Word* and *Keys*. Do you mean all these? Or which of them?

1. All Christian Churches are tied by the common Divine Rule; and is not consent to that enough to make a Church? 2. Churches of various Nations may be under one Humane Rule of Agreement or Contract. 3. The same Princes may give divers Rules about Accidents to the Churches of one Kingdom, and also the same Rule for some Accidents to divers Churches under them, who differ in other great things: And doth agreement in those Accidents do more to make them *One Church*, than their difference in Integrals to make them many? 4. Princes may do as the *Roman* Emperours long did; leave the Bishops in Councils to make their own Rules by consent, and make no common Imperial Rule for them: Are they ever the less One Church? 5. The *Roman* Empire and Councils both left the several Bishops to make Rules for Liturgies and other Accidents for their several Churches: Were they therefore the less one National Church?

So that I am no more acquainted by your Words what you mean by a *whole Church*, than if you had said nothing. There is a *whole Diocesan Church*, and a *whole Parish Church*, as well as a *whole National Church*: And what the Power is, and what the Rule of Order must be, whether the Laws of Princes or Prelates, and whether about Essential, or Integrals, or Accidents, and what Accidents, whether all, or many, or few, and which, that must make a Church to be *One whole Church*, you never tell us. An Infidel Prince or a Heretick Prince may give the same Rule

Rule of Order to his Christian Subjects in a whole Kingdom; Is he therefore the constitutive Church-Head? Or will you say, as your Mr. *Rich. Hooker* doth, *That if he be the Head of a Christian Church, it is necessary that he be a Christian*? To tell us of [*Common Ties and Rules of Order*] and never tell us what those Ties and Rules are, may serve your Ends, but not my Edification.

§. 17. But I remember your *Irenicum* learnedly maintaineth, that God hath instituted no one Form of Church-Government as necessary: And if so, then not a National Church-Form. And is it not a *whole Church, if it be without a Form*, which not God but Man is the Authour of? Then God made or instituted no such thing as a *whole Church*. Then it is a humane Creature. Then why may not Man make yet more Forms; and multiply, and make and unmake, as he seeth cause? and several Countries have several Forms. And, *forma dat nomen & esse*: And if God made not any *whole Church*, we should be acquainted who they be (that were not a Church) that had Power to make a first Church-Form? and who hath the Power ever since? and how it is proved? and how it cometh to be any great matter to separate from a Church-Form which God never made? and whether humane Church-Forms be not essential and constitutive Causes of the Churches? and whether every commanded Oath, Subscription, Declaration, Office or Ceremony, be an essential part of this Church-Form? And there be as many Church-Forms and Species, as there be Orders, Liturgies and Ceremonies. And all these Differences in the same Kingdom constitute so many Schisms and Separations.

§. 18. Do you take all the Christians in the *Turkish* Empire to be one National Church, or not? If not, then one Head or Humane Law is not necessary to the being or Government of a Church, nor is it necessary that it be National. And do you think that the *Greek* Churches have not Power to govern and reform themselves, though they be not a National Church? Why did *Paul* write to *Corinth* (as *Clemens* also did) and to the *Galatians*, &c. and *John* to *Ephesus*, and the other six, *Rev.* 2. & 3. to reform themselves, if they had not Power to do it? But if all the Christians under the *Turk* be one National Church; then it is either because they have one Civil Head, or one Ecclesiastical Head. Not the latter, for they have none such; though the Bishops of *Constantinople* have some *Primacy* by their old Canons and Customs. Not the former; for an Infidel cannot be an essential part of a Christian Church (as a constituted Head is.)

§. 19. And the Churches in the *Roman* Empire before *Constantine*, were

true Churches of Christ's Institution, and they had power to govern and reform themselves; and yet they had no humane Constitutive Head, Regal or Sacerdotal, though they had a Civil Heathen Governour, which was an extrinsick accidental Head.

It is so contrary to all Sence and Religion, that either a Man as a Man, or a Family, or a Church as such, should have no power to govern and reform it self, that I must needs judge that while you speak confusedly, you meant only a Regal or Supreme Civil Power, which yet is *totâ specie* distinct from that which is properly Ecclesiastical.

§. 20. Serm. p. 17. [*And so the several Churches of the* Lydian or *Proconsular* Asia, *if they had been united in one Kingdom, and governed by the same Authority, under the same Rules, might have bin truly called the* Lydian *Church.*]

Answ. 1. And is the Controversy *de nomine*, *Whether they might be called the* Lydian *Church*, when we expected a satisfactory explication *de re*? No doubt but a Church is so equivocal a word, that many sort of Assemblies or Societies may be so called. I have told you of divers Sences, in which we are called a *Church National*, first *Plea*, *pag.* 251. *&c.* Either a *Christian Kingdom*, or else the Churches of an Heathen or a Christian King, as associated by agreement, may be called a *National Church.*

2. What if they be united in one Kingdom, of a Heathen, *Mahometan*, or *Arrian* King, and governed by his Regal Authority, under the *same Rules* which he sets them? Is this that which you mean in your Description? A King as such is not an Ecclesiastical Person, and therefore is not an essential part of a Church, unless as it is equivocally so called. And is it his Civil Laws for Church-Government that you mean, or the Clergies Canons, or God's Laws? The *Greeks* under the *Turk* are under one Prince, and governed by the same Civil Authority and Laws, and also are under one Patriarch, and by the Princes toleration are governed by the Ecclesiastick Authority, and Laws of another Species: If you confound these two Species, or tell us not which you mean in your Definition, it tendeth not to Edification.

3. And what if they be under divers Kings (as the *Bulgarians* and *Greeks* were) and yet ruled by one Ecclesiastical Authority and Law? why may not they also be called *One Church*, as the *Moscovits* are now called part of the *Greek Church*?

4. And why might it not be called the *Lydian* Church while it was a part of the Empire, as the *African* and other Countries were? But what is all this *de nomine* to the Controversie? All grant that the Civil Power must be obeyed in their place, and the Church-power in theirs.

5. But here you grant that *they are several Churches* before their Union in one Kingdom. And I suppose they were Churches, 1. of another Species than

than the *National* described by you, 2. and were of *Divine* Institution; 3. and continue so after their Union in one Kingdom; 4. and have power to govern and reform themselves still, though not Regal Power.

§. 21. Serm. '[*Just as several Families united, make one Kingdom, which at 'first had a distinct and independent power: but it would make strange confusion 'in the World to reduce Kingdoms back again to Families, because at first they were made up of them.*]

Answ. And are they not several Families still? and have they not still a distinct *Family-power* to govern and reform themselves, tho not a *Regal Power*? Do they make a City or Kingdom dissolve Families? You cannot mean it. What mean you then by *reducing these Kingdoms back to Families*, when they are [illegible]? Had you said, that *dissolving Kingdoms or Cities*, and *reducing them to be only Families*, is confusion, it's undeniable. But still as Families in a Kingdom retain *Family-Power*, so particular Churches in a Kingdom retain the Church-power which God by his Institution gave them. And this is that we desire.

§. 22. Serm. '[*Thus National Churches are National Societies of Christians 'under the same Laws of Government and Rules of Worship.*]

Ans. 1. All Christians are under the same *Divine Laws* and *Rules*. 2. Some Princes make no Church-Laws to Christians, but their Civil Laws for the common Peace. And some make various Laws for various sorts of Christians under them.

§. 23. Serm. '[*For the true Notion of a Church, is no more than a Society of 'Men, united together for their Order and Government according to the Rules of the 'Christian Religion.*

Answ. 1. There be many true Notions of such an equivocal word as a [*Church*] is. 2. The *Generical Notion* sure is not enough for the definition of each *species*. There must be more. The Universal Church is a *Society of Men so united*; and so may the Churches of divers Kingdoms; and so is a Christian Kingdom as such; and so is a Provincial *Church*, and a Diocesan *Church*, and a particular Parochial *Church*: yet all these are not of the same *species*, for they have different *terminos in specie*. 3. This is a very defective Definition, where 1. [*Men*] are made the qualified Subject, when it should have bin [*Christians*]. 2. The two constitutive essential Relations of *Pastor* and *Flock* are not mentioned, as if a Kingdom were defined without the mention of *King* and *Subjects*. 3. They are said to be *united* in general, without telling us what uniting is meant, whether only by *force*, *command*, or *consent*, whereas most take even the Mode of Investiture (*Baptism*) as well as *Consent*, to be necessary *ad esse*, as to the *Visible Church*. 4. It is said they are united [*for*

Order and Government,] as if these were but the *Terminus*; and so may those by agreement *de futuro*, that yet have no Government: whereas the Government is the *constitutive* Form. 5. This Definition leaving out the *specifick Form* and *Terminus*, maketh an Army a Navy, a Ship, a Company of *Christian Merchants*, or *Corporation*, &c. to be a *Church*: for all these may be *Societies of Men united together for their Order and Government, according to the Rules of the Christian Religion*: For the *Christian Religion* giveth Rules to all sorts of *Christian Societies*. These are not the usual ways of defining, nor give me any true notice of your sence. 6. And you make it not intelligible, whether by the *Rules* of the *Christian Religion* you mean only the *Divine Rule*? and whether you mention it as the *uniting Bond*, or only as a *Rule* to some *humane Rule*? But though the application look this way, yet your words speak no more then what is common to the *Churches* which you accuse that are [*united for Order and Government according to the Rules of the Christian Religion.*] If this will serve, those are thus united that take the Bible for their Rule of Order, *&c.* But is not this against those *Churches*, that take not the *Bible*, but *Canons*, or other humane Laws for the bound of their *Church-Union*, or their Rule? If it be *uniting for Order and Government according to the Rules of the Christian Religion*, which maketh a *Church*, let us then try which Societies are so united, and let that be the matter of our Dispute.

§. 24. Serm. p. 13. [*And it is a great mistake to make the Notion of a Church 'barely to relate to Acts of Worship and consequently that an adequat Notion of 'a Church is an Assembly for Divine Worship; by which means they appropriate the 'Name of Churches to particular Congregations: whereas if this held true, the 'Church must be dissolved as soon as the Congregation is broken up. But if they re-'tain the nature of a Church when they do not meet together for Worship, then 'there is some other Bond that uniteth them; and what ever that is, it constitutes 'the Church.*

Answ. 1. Did you write this as a *Confutation* of any body? If so, you should have told them who are your Adversaries. I never met with one to my remembrance that saith, the *Church is no longer a Church than they are congregate*, but Mr. *Cheney*, who writeth against my *Plea for Peace*. And so the two first who now write against me, write against one another, and I must please them both. When you so far differ among your selves, you should bear with them that less differ from you.

2. What mean you by the [*Notion of a Church*] which all Men know is an equivocal word? Do you mean that a [*Church*] hath but one *Notion*? I pray you tell us, whether the Notion be the same as it is used, *Mat.* 16. 18. *&* 18. 17. 1 *Cor.* 11. 18, 22. *Act.* 19. 32, —39, 40. 1 *Cor.* 14. 34. *Psal.* 26. 5. *Ephes.* 5. 27. 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. *Act.* 5. 11. *Acts* 20. 28. *Rev.* 2. 12, 18. *Rom.* 16. 5. *Phil.*

Phil. 2. 10. *Acts* 8. 1, 3. *Ephes.* 5. 23. *Col.* 1. 18. *Ephes.* 1. 22. *&* 5. 23. Doth any Man beleive that it is in all these Texts taken in the same Notion (or sence)? I am sure I need not ask this of you as to the sence of prophane Authors, who use the word for any sort of *Concilium. catus, contio, congregatio, convivia*, as in *Lucian, Demosthenes, Aristotle, Thucidides*, &c.

3. If you will pardon me for telling Men in Print so often, that a *Church* is constituted not only for *Communion* in *Worship*, but also in *Doctrine*, and *holy Living*, I will not ask you, why you dissembled this? nor why you would intimate the contrary to your Readers? Repetition is not the least fault of my Writings, and all will not prevent the mis-intimations even of such worthy Men as you. *Ad nauseam usq*, I have repeated, that the Office of the Ministery standeth in a subordination to the three parts of Christ's Office, Prophetical or Teaching, Priestly or Worshiping, Kingly or Ruling; and that a particular *Church* is associated for the use and benefit of all three conjunctly. Were you not willing to take notice of this? or not willing that others should take notice of it?

4. How many Writings of ours have told the World, that *we appropriate not the Notion of the Church to a particular Congregation.* Do not my Books which you cite, copiously express the contrary? Do we not over and over tell Men, that the word [*Church*] must be considered as *equivocal, generical*, and *specifical*? Do we take [*the Holy Catholick Church*] in the Creed for a *particular Congregation*? Worthy Sir, this is unworthy dealing, whether it be by ignorance, negligence, rashness or wilfulness. We distinguish between *Churches* of God's *Institution*, and of *Man's Invention.* And of the first sort, what *Independent* is there that holdeth not an *Universal Church* at least, beside particular Congregations? And of Man's making, who can number the sorts that are and may be made?

5. Did you ever know Man, (save such Conformists as he that answered my Plea) whether *Greek, Papist, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independent*, or *Anabaptist*, who denieth a *Church Bond*, that uniteth them when the Congregation is dismiss'd? All confess, that the Union of the *pars regens* and *pars subdita* for *Church-ends* doth make it a *Church.* And who doth not distinguish between the *Constitution* and *Administration*, the *Status* and the *Exercitium*?

6 How then could you say, [*If this be true, the Church must be dissolved as soon as the Congregation is broken up*]? What shew is there of such a consequence? What if we held that the Church were so called barely in *relation* to *Publick Worship*? doth it follow that this Relation ceaseth as soon as the several Acts of Worship cease? Their mutual consent, and the union of the Worshippers, Priest and People associated for that use, may continue

tinue when the Act of Worship is intermitted. May it not continue a Shool, when the Boys go home, or play? May it not be a Parliament when the House is risen, tho it be only for the work of assembled Men that they are related and denominated?

7. But Sir, do you not confess, even in your *Irænicon*, where you maintain that no Form of Church-Government is of Divine command: 1. That God hath commanded that there be *Assemblies* ordinarily used for his Worship. 2dly, And that Pastors are to be the Guides and chief Managers of this Worship. 3dly, And that they should be also their Teachers. 4thly, And that they govern them by their Keys. And if all this be true, then such *Assemblies* are of Divine Institution; not such as are associated only for Worship, but for *Doctrine*, *Worship*, *and holy Living*, under the Teaching and Conduct of their Pastors. If you deny that such *Churches* as we call *Particular*, are of Divine Institution, we have often proved it, though few Christians deny it, or need any proof.

And it is so oft repeated in the Books which you cite, that I must suppose you know it, though you seem to dissemble it, that the Definition which I give of such a Church doth make the *Terminus* to be (not the whole Church meeting at one time and place, but) *personal*, *presential Communion* in Doctrine, Worship, and Holy Conversation, as distinct from absent Communion by Delegates or Letters only. Your Parish is associated for such *personal presential Communion*, and yet they meet not all at once, but some one day, and some another, and some not at all, which is a fault *in exercitio*, but overthroweth not the being of the *Church*, while it is *personal present Communion* which they associate for and profess, and that states the *Church-relation*. And they meet not all in one place, but some in the Bishop of *Ely*'s *Chappel*, (and it is pity but you had many more); and yet *Chappels* of Ease consist with some Obligations on the whole Parish ordinarily, to have *per vices* sometime *personal Communion* in the Parish Church.

If you would have told us plainly, that Parish-Churches are no Churches, or that God never ordained such single Churches as are associated for *personal Communion* in Presence, in Doctrine, Worship, and Conversation, which have their proper Pastors, we should have known what to say to you. But if you deny not such, (which we undertake fully to prove) plainly confess their *Constitution*, Worth, and Privileges, and we shall readily next debate the Case with you, how far Men may associate these into larger Churches of another *species*. But still we say, that as *Families* cease not to be Families, when they are combined into a *Village*, or *City*; no more do *particular Churches* lose their Constitution or Administration by being associated into any lawful larger Churches.

§. 25.

§. 25. Serm. '[*And if there be one Catholick Church consisting, of multitudes* '*of particular Churches, consenting in one Faith; then why may there not be one* '*National Church from consent in the same Articles?* &c.]

Ans. 1. I pray confess first, that your *National* doth consist of a *multitude* of such *particular Churches* of God's Institution, and cannot destroy them or their Power and Privileges: Secondly; And once tell us what you mean by a *National Church*, whether Regal or Sacerdotal. If you mean a *Christian Kingdom*, who denies it: If you mean all the Churches of a Kingdom associated for Concord as Equals, we deny it not. If you mean that the Nation must be one Church, as united in one Sacerdotal Head, personal or collective, Monarchical or Aristocratical, we must have further satisfaction about this: First, whether it be of Divine or of Humane Institution? Secondly, whether (if humane) its Power be from the Prince, or from the *consent* of the particular Churches? Thirdly, what it is empowered to do? 1. Not to make necessary Laws for the *Churches* of the same sort with Christ's already made. 2. Not to cross any of his Laws. 3. Not to destroy any Privilege of the particular Churches instituted by Christ. 4. But if it be only to determine of such Circumstances as the Christian Prince may determine of, we shall obey them as his Officers.

And now to your [*Why not?*] I answer. Man is not God. God made the Form of the *Universal Church*, of which the particular are parts; whose Form also is of his making: And if God hath made *National Regent Churches* as distinct from *Christian Kingdoms* and *Commonwealths*, we will obey them; if not, we must know what Men made them, and by what authority, and whether God authorized them thereto; if not, your [*Why not*] is answered.

§. 26. Serm. p. 18. [*Nay, if it be mutual Consent and Agreement which* '*make a Church, then why may not National Societies agreeing together in the same* '*Faith, and under the same Government and Discipline, be as truly and properly a* '*Church as any particular Congregation?*

Ans. 1. It is only *de nomine* or *de re* that you ask? If *de nomine*, we grant you, that a Parliament, an Army may be truly called *Ecclesia*; if *de re*, we grant you that it is truly a Church of another kind. 2. Mutual Consent makes a Church, but *God's Consent or Institution* must go first to warrant that Consent, and make it a Church which he will own: Else mutual Consent may make it but *Jeroboam*'s Church, or a false and sinful Policy. Prove, if you can, that God hath authorized Men to make as many new Church-Species, Policies or Forms as they please; or any against, or above, or equal to those of his Institution, besides *Magistracy*.

§. 27.

§. 27. Serm. p. 19. *Why many of these Cities, united under one civil Government, and the same Rules of other Religion, should not be called one National Church, I cannot understand: which makes me wonder at those who say they cannot tell what we mean by the Church of England:* Sacrileg. Desert. p. 35.

Answ. 1. *Admiratio est ignorantis*: I am as ignorant of you, as you are of me; therefore may answer wondering with wondering; 1. That such a Man should not know the reason, when I so plainly and distinctly wrote it down. 2. And that while you wonder, you should not vouchsafe to give me the least means of Satisfaction. For I suppose few will think that you do so much as attempt it here. 3. You make still as if the Controversie were *de nomine*, what it *may be called*; when I only spake *de re*, and bid you call it *what you will*, if you will but tell us your meaning. 4. Yea in my Plea. sect. 4, 5. and in the Addition: I fully shewed what we grant *de re*, *& de nomine*, and what we deny; and what the state of our Controversie is: and do you think to satisfie us, after all this with *Wondering* that we understand not what you mean?

§. 28. Serm. [*In short, we mean, that Society of Christian People, which in this Nation are united under the same Profession of Faith, the same Laws of Government*, and *Rules of Divine Worship.*]

Answ. And will not they, that know not your Heart any otherwise than by such Words, deride us, if we should pretend by these Words, to be ever the nearer understanding your Resolution of the Controversie?

1. The essential constitutive Parts of a political Society are the *Pars regens & pars subdita*: (as is aforesaid.) And here is no mention of the *Regent part* at all; can any Man tell by this whether it be the *King*, or a *Clergy Head*, that you take to be the Constitutive Head?

2. *Laws* and *Rules* are part of the *Administration*, and our question is of the *Constitution*. Is this then any satisfying Definition?

3. The Papists by this Definition are the National Church [*They are a Society* of *Christian People, which in this Nation are united under the same Profession of Faith, the same Laws of Government*, and *Rules* of *Divine Worship*] viz. *Papal*. If you say, *They are not all the Nation.* I answer, 1. nor doth your Definition require it. 2. *You* are not all.

If you say that they are not the major part. I answer; 1. Whether you *are* I know not. 2. In *Ireland* they are, and so are *there* the National Church by your Definition.

If you say that you mean the Laws of *Lawful* Governours. I answer, 1. The Papists take the Pope for their Lawful Governour: 2. If a Usurper get Possession (as K. *Stephen*, and many others) is the National Church then dead or null? 3. There is no mention of *lawful* in your Definition.

4. But though you will not tell us whether you mean *Divine* or *Humane Laws*

Laws and *Rules*, yet I may confidently conjecture that it is *Humane* you mean: for else, 1. I am of the same National Church that you are; yea if I prove that I am more conformable to God's Laws than you, and such as you, I shall prove that it will be a harder question whether you are of the Church of *Eng.* than whether I am. 2. And you might know that such a Church we no more deny than you do (at least) 3. But then it can be but *sincere* (not perfect) Obedience to God's Laws and Rules, which must prove one to be of this Church; or else no Man is of it. And then you must shew us whether a mistake in as small a matter as Meat and Drink, or a Ceremony, or Liturgick Form, or Diocesan order, do cut one off from that Church. If yea, than how much more would such Conformity to sin do it? which we fear.

But supposing that you mean *Humane Laws.* 5. Why may not *Divine* Laws make a Church? If Humane Laws were necessary *ad bene esse*, the Christians that I have read and converst with, think that they are not necessary to the *Being* of a Church *in sensu famosiore*; why then should they be in the Definition, and only they?

6. But the difficulty recurreth as to *Humane Laws*, which of them are necessary to the *Being* of the Church: For your Definition distinguished not: The King hath great and excellent Laws which we all conform to: Doth not our Conformity to these seem to prove us of the National Church, though we conform not to your Formalities and Oaths and Ceremonies? Imperfect Obedience serveth to continue men Subjects to the King: It is not every Drunkeness, or Oath, or Fornication, much less the miss of a Complement or Ceremony, that makes a Man a Rebel or an Outlaw: Why then should the refusal of a Prelates Subscription or Formality unchurch a sound and honest Christian?

7. And if the humane Laws and Rules which you mentioned (whatever you mean by them) be subordinate to God's Laws, and so be honest, good and obligatory, why should they cut off those from the Church which Christ's *Laws* cut not off; yea which Christ receiveth and commandeth us to receive? *Receive him, for God receiveth him:* and, *receive him as Christ receiveth us*, (notwithstanding our Infirmities) were good reasonings in St. *Paul*'s Judgment, which I prefer before any Bishops that I know.

8. And a Man of less Acquaintance or Wit than you, cannot be ignorant, what abundance of Differences there are among your selves. I have named you no small number in my 2d Plea: some of you are hot against that which is called *Arminianism*, and some hot for it: some are for Bishops and Presbyters being of one Order, and some of divers: all are not of the mind of the Bishop of *Hereford* that wrote *Naked Truth*: some (even Bishops) think that the damnatory part of *Athanasius*'s Creed is not approved by Conformity: others, think that it is all to be approved: A multitude such

differences there are among your selves: And why should not this as much unchurch some of you, if it be [*being under the same Laws*] that maketh you one Church, as the forbearing of a Declaration of Assent and Consent, or of a Surplice, *&c.*

9. Especially tell us, whether the Conformist's difference about the *Constitutive Regent Part* of the Church of *England*, some being for *one Species*, and some for *another*, do not plainly make them to be of *two distinct Churches* of *England*, and further different from each other than we are from any part. We justly say the Papists, who are for *two Species* of Soveraigns, some for the *Pope*, and some for a general Council, are plainly of two Churches: for the regent part is essential. And I am sure that one part of the most Eminent Disputers for the Church of *England* and Conformity, say that the King is the *Extraneous* Civil Governour, but the Bishops are the *Constitutive Essential Internal Governours* of the Church as a Church; and that if the Bishops command the use of one Translation, Version, Metre, Liturgie, and the King another, we are to obey the Bishops, and not the King: And that the efficient cause of a National Church, is the Bishops Agreement among themselves to associate into such a Church. And others say, that it is the King and his Laws, that are the efficient of such a Church, and are to be obeyed in matter of the Circumstances of Worship, *&c.* before the Bishops. Can you prove that this difference between the Conformists, about the very Constitutive Regent Power, is not greater than Mens differences about a Ceremony or Form? and doth not more to make them to be of two Churches?

10 If all this confused stir be but about *a Christian Kingdom*, be it known to you, that we take such to be of *Divine Command*: And if you know it not, or dissemble it, after I have said so much of it, in the first Plea, and elsewhere, I cannot help that, *viz.* if you will talk publickly against what you know, or know not when told, because you will not know. But I have there largly told you, what the Power of Princes about Church matters is, which if you will not read, I will not repeat.

11. Your Words [*Laws and Rules*] would induce one to think that you joyned the *Kings Laws* and the *Bishop's Canons* together in your meaning, as the bond of Unity. If so, is it two sorts of Governours, (by the Sword, and by the Word, Magistrates and Pastors) which you take for the constitutive regent parts of the Church? If so, then either in Coordination and Coalition, or in Subordination. The first cannot be, that the two Species in Coalition should make one Head, unless both were in the King as *Persona Mixta*, both Lay and Clergie, as some affirm him to be like *Melchizedeck*: But this both King and Clergie disown. Nor can the second be, because a subordinate Power is not essential to the whole body politick, but only the supreme. And the Magistracy and Ministry are coordinate

Species

Species, both depending immediately on God, and Subordinate Mutually only *Secundum quid*: Nor is the Legislative power in *England* any other than one, which is in the *King* and *Parliament* conjunct. The Bishops Cannons are not Laws *Ejusdem Speciei*; till the *King* and *Parliament* make them such. If this be your Judgment, there are I think but few *Conformists* of your mind.

12. I must Conjecture therefore by your words, That the *Laws* and *Rules* which you define the Church by, are the *Laws* of the *King* and *Parliament*; and that it is the Civil Christian Sovereign that you take for the Constitutive Head of that National Church which you plead for; or else I know not what to Conjecture. And if this be your Meaning, I add to what is said: 1. *Erastians* have hitherto been distasted by the *Bishops*, and I doubt they will by this take you for somewhat worse.

2. What doth your *National Church* differ from a *Christian Kingdom*, which we deny not?

3. Do you think there is no other Species of a *Church*, besides that which is Constituted by the Christian Magistrate as Head.

1. All the Christian World, as far as I can learn by History (no considerable part excepted) have been in all Ages, and to this Day are of another mind. And who then is the great *Nonconformist* and *Separatist*, You or I; if this be your mind?

2. The Magistracy, and Pastoral Office are of different Species: Therefore the Churches Constituted by their Regency are of different Species.

3. *Constantines* words have hitherto been commonly received, That He (and so Christian *Kings*) was *Bishop* without the *Church*, and the proper *Bishop* within: that is, That he was the Governour of the Church, by the Sword, as the *King* is of all Schollars, Physitians, Families, *&c.* but not the Governour by the *Word* and *Keys?* as the *King* is not a School-Master, Physitian, or the formal Specifying Governour of School, Colledge, Family, as such. Bishop *Bilson*, of *Subjection*, most clearly openeth the difference, and I think Christians commonly agree to it; between the Office of Governing by the *Sword*, and by the *Word*, even about the Church it self.

4. Christ setled immediately the Pastoral Office, and did not leave it to Princes to make it: And He settled Churches under the Pastors, when there were no Christian Princes; And when the *Emperours* became Christians, they never took themselves to be the intrinsick Constitutive Rectors of the Churches, but

Accidental Heads, as is aforesaid. And all the Councils, and their Canons fully shew, that the *Bishops* were still of this mind. And our greatest Defenders of the Power of Princes, *Bilson*, *Andrews*, *Buckeridge*, *Spalatensis*, &c. were of the same mind, and ascribe to them no more.

5. Else Heathen and infidel Princes might be Essential to the Church in the Gospel-Notion: For they are the Governours of it by the Sword, and may possibly by the Councel of Christians, make them as good Laws as many Christian Princes do. *Julian* made no great Change of the Church-Laws.

But I Labour in vain, in proving that there is a *Sacerdotal* or *Clergy-Church Form or Species*; for I suppose you cannot deny it; and if you do, few others will. I suppose it is only the *National-Form*, which you take to be Constituted by a Lay-Head. But few Christians will deny, That the Sacerdotal or Clergy-form of a particular Church, is of Divine institution; and that Men have not power to destroy that Form; or change the Office there, Instituted by the *Holy Ghost*. Though the Forms of *Associated Churches*, *Diocesan*, *Metropolitan*, *Provincial*, *Patriarchal*, are judged by very many, to be of Humane Invention: And what Man may make, Man on good Reason may unmake or alter. But if you grant us the Divine form before mentioned; I shall Grant you that a *National Church* is also of Divine Command; if you mean but a Christian Kingdom. But when one Form is Denominated from the *Pastoral Office* related to the Flock, and the other from the *Magistrates Office*: What hath a Man that can understand the State of the Controversy, to do here; but to shew what is the *Pastoral Office* towards the Church, and what is the *Magistrates?* For sure they are not the same. And yet because that it is the *Pastoral Form* which the word [*Church*] denoteth in the strict and usual Christian Sence: Our Sovereignes in *England*, to avoid the *Papists* Exceptions, have forsaken the Title of [*Head* of the *Church*] lest they should seem to claim a Constitutive Headship of a Church strictly taken, and use only the Term [*Governour.*] Even as *Christ* is said by St. *Paul*, *Eph.* 1. to be *Head over all things*, *To the Church* [*Over* and *To*] much differ.

And I yet see not why on the same Reason that we call a Christian Kingdom, or Republick a *National Church*; we may not also call *London*, *York*, &c. a *City-Church*, as Headed by the *Mayor*, as the Christian Magistrate, and so talk of *Provincial*,

cial, Conſular, and Proconſular Churches, Monarchical, Ariſtocratical, Democratical Churches; and make all the Controverſies [which Church-Form is beſt] as Politicks do what Form of a *Common-Wealth* is beſt.

And thus they that chide the *Independents* for making the *People* Governours of their little Congregations (which I think yet moſt of them diſclaim) do this way quite exceed them in Popularity, and in *Democraties*, will make the People Governours of all the *Churches*, even National including the particulars. For I ſuppoſe they will not ſay, that *Democratical*, Civil Government is unlawfull.

And whereas *Cyprian* ſaith: *Ubi Epiſcopus, ibi Eccleſia*; you will ſay, *Where* the *Mayor* or *Bayliff* is, there is the *Church*, But I trow the *Biſhop* of *London* beleiveth that there is another ſort of *London-Church-Form*, beſides my Lord-*Mayors* Relation to them. But what abundance of *Church-Forms*; Supream and Subordinate may diverſity of Magiſtracy make?

§. 29. Serm p. 19. [*I do not intend to ſpeak of the Terms upon which Perſons are to be admitted among us to the Exerciſe of the function of the Miniſtry*; *but of the Terms of* Lay-Communion, *i. e. thoſe which are neceſſary for Perſons to joyn in our Prayers and Sacraments, and other Offices of Divine Worſhip.*

Anſw. 1. But your work would have been done more effectually if you had begun at the part which you intend not to ſpeak of: I ſuppoſe it is not for want of *Charity*, nor *Concern*, that you intend it not; and therefore, ſuppoſe that ſomebody elſe will do it at laſt. I have heard of ſome above your order, than could better ſpare the *Nonconforming* Miniſters than the People; and ſaid plainly, that they increaſed the Impoſitions, becauſe they could do better without us, than with us: And ſome have ſaid, If this will not caſt them out, more ſhall do it. I take it for granted, that this preterniitted part of your Work, is indeed, the All that you have to do, in the Works of *Accuſing*, and Afflicting the *Nonconformiſts*; and till this be done, the reſt of your Accuſations will confute themſelves; and I doubt not but it will be attempted; and if it be truly, and ſatisfactory, I will give you thanks.

2. Your Term of [*Lay-Communion*] remembreth me, that if (as you ſeem) you *Eſſentiate* your *Church* of *England* by a *Lay-Ruler*, and his Laws, *viz.* the *King*, and the Laws made by him for Religious Government; the People that you accuſe are no Separatiſts, though they Separate from the *Dioceſans*? be-

becauſe they hold this *Lay-Communion*; that is, though they are not perfectly Obedient, they are ſubjects of the *Lay-Governour*, and ſo Members of the Kingdom, which is the *National-Church*.

3. And as to your *Lay-Communion* here ſpoken of, *So far as it is Lawful*, where you have Preach'd or Written for it once, I think, I have done it many times: I ſhall be far from Contradicting you in that.

§. 30. Sermon p. 20. [*I will not ſay, there hath been a great deal of Art uſed to confound theſe two (and it is eaſy to diſcern to what purpoſe it is.)*

Anſw. 1. I have not Art enough well to reconcile your *Negative*, and your *Parentheſis*, which intimateth an Affirmation: If you will not ſay ſuch Art *was uſed*; how can you intimate [*to what purpoſe it's uſed.*] Can you tell ſo eaſily *why it was done*, and not tell that indeed it *was done* at all? But perhaps you *can tell*, though you *will not*. I would fain know why: No man that Reads your words, can well believe that it is through the redundancy of your kindneſs.

2. Forgive this Truth: Of all Men that have Written againſt *Nonconformity*, I remember few that may, worſe than you ſpeak againſt *CONFOUNDING*; as I ſhall further prove.

3. If I be one of thoſe that you ſpeak of, *Confounding* is not the greateſt fault of your words; while it is viſible that in my firſt *Plea* I diſtinctly enumerated the Caſe of the Nonconformity of the Laity and the Clergy. And I ſpeak by conſent for many of my acquaintance. And I am likeſt to be meant by you, becauſe divers others, that go farther from you, take Lay-conformity to be unlawful, and largely give their reaſons for it. How then did you expect to be believed when our Books are in ſo many hands?

4. None are fitter Judges of Arts, than the moſt exerciſed Artificers: If you are skill'd and exerciſed in ſuch *Arts* your ſelf, you may the eaſiler diſcern both the Art and purpoſe. And yet we are ſo neer our ſelves that I cannot eaſily believe that you know my Arts or purpoſes ſo well as I do my ſelf.

§ 31. Serm. [' *I dare ſay the People's not underſtanding the difference of theſe two Caſes hath been a great occaſion of the preſent Separation*]

Anſw. No doubt but there is a great difference between the Miniſters Caſe of Conformity, and the peoples, which makes ſome of them think much worſe of a Conforming Miniſter, than of a Conforming Lay-man: which ſheweth that the difference is not wholly

wholly unknown to them. But I think I have done more to acquaint them with the difference, than you or any of your tribe have done.

§ 32. Serm. [*'For in the Judgment of the most impartial men 'of the Dissenters at this day, though they think the Case of the Mini-'sters very hard on the account of Subscriptions and Declarations 'required of them, yet they confess, very little is to be said on the 'behalf of the People, from whom none of those things are required.*]

Ans. 1. This is but such Confusion as constituteth this Sermon. We think that nothing of truth can be said for any of the People's errors; no more than for the [*very hard*] and sinful case of our selves if we should Conform: If any go one step too far from you, they are unjustifiable therein: But we have shewed those that will see, that much may be said on the People's behalf for much of their Nonconformity, and also for such assembling as you call separation.

2. And surely if you had the due sense of your *Brethrens Case*, of your *Own Case*, and of the *Kingdoms Case*, you would perceive how necessary the forbearing of the imposition of those *very hard* things is to the healing of that which doth offend you; and to greater ends than that.

§ 33 Serm. [*So that the People are condemned in their separation by their own teachers; But how they can preach lawfully to a People who commit a fault in hearing them, I do not understand.*]

Ans 1. The People that are guilty of any sinful separation are reproved by us; but not those that separate no further than is their duty. In my first *Plea* I described no less than 30 Cases in which separation is a sin; and neer 40 Instances in which some separation is a duty or no sin: And of all this you here take no notice, and tosse the bare confounding name of *Separation*, as if the Sound ought to affright men from all that you are against; sure you could never think that we had Brains or Consciences, if such dealing should pass for satisfactory with us: Can any man tell by this bare *Name*, or any thing in your Book, what that Separation is which you condemn. The word *Heresie* with a Papist, and the word [*Separation*] and [*Schism*] with some Conformists, seem to be terms of Art: But what art is it? sure it is not the Cartesian nor the Epicurean Philosophy, which layeth so much on *Atomes and Motion*: I cannot Imagine what Contexture of Atomes should cause the Sound of the word [*Separation*] or [*Schism*] to make such a motion as should drive men out of their Religion and Wits. I am not so happy as to be an Academical Graduate; but I have long ago read *Lullius* and many of his Com-

Commentators; and I find no Philosophy more likely, to lay much on the Power of words; except that which we call Magick or Charming. For my part, I was born with a Disease (if it be such) that hateth Confusion and Deceit, and inclineth me to bring things into light, and to discern between things that differ. And if you Doctors have learned the Art of Reducing a *Syllogism* into a *Simple terme* or *Name*, it is quite above my kind of Learning: I suppose it is such a Logical contracted Syllogism that you intend: But as *short writing* called *Characters* though expeditious, is hard to be read by others; so your contracted Syllogism, in the name [*Separation*] and [*Schism*] will be more useful to you and yours, than to strangers that never saw your heart. If *Usefulness* and *Usedness*, even by some of the Reverend, may afford us a Prognostick, I may conjecture that even Lying (and other necessary arts) are ascending in hope to be placed among the Cardinal virtues, and those that scruple it, may be numbred with Schismaticks, Separatists, and Rogues.

§. 34. If I would here again tell you what Separation I take to be lawful, and what unlawful, and desire you to define that which you accuse me of, I may expect that in your Reply you will dissemble it; But I will trie you with a few instances of one sort, and desire you to tell me which it is that you mean.

I. Do you think that he is a *Separatist* that meeteth not in the same Parish-Church with you? No sure: For then you are one to others, and other Parishes such to you.

II. Is he a Separatist that liveth in your Parish, and ordinarily meeteth not in your Temple, but another allowed place? If so, the Bishop of *Eli* is a Separatist in your Parish, that keepeth a Meeting in his Chappel when you Preach. If not so, when we had the Kings License at least, the *place* made Us not Separatists.

III. Is every one a Separatist that differeth from you in Doctrine, in publick Preaching? If so, are you not Separatists one from another, when one Preacheth for that which is called, Absolute Election, Reprobation, Universal Redemption, Free-will, Falling from justification, the morality of the Sabbath, *&c.* and others against these? If not; Is not difference in such Doctrines as great a difference, as useing and not useing some of your Liturgick Forms and Ceremonies?

IV. Are all different modes of Worship enough to make our Party *Separatists?* Then the *French* and *Dutch* Churches are Separatists, and either the Cathedrals or the Parish-Churches, as to their Vestments, Organs, Chore, mode of Singing, *&c.* And the allowed private Baptismes and Communion with the sick, are Separations.

V. Doth

V. Doth every disobedience to the King, and Laws, and Canons in matters of Religion, Government and Worship, make men Separatists? If so, then when ever a Conformist disobediently shorteneth his Common-Prayer, or leaveth off his Surplice, or giveth the Sacrament to one that kneeleth not, or receiveth one of another Parish to Communion, *&c.* he is a Separatist. Yea, no Man then is not a Separatist sometimes.

VI. If the Diocesane be the lowest political Church and a Parish but a part of a Church, as they hold that take a Bishop to be a Constitutive part; how is he said to separate from the Church that owneth his Diocesane and the Diocess, what-ever place in that Diocess he meet in, seeing he separateth not from the Kingdom that stayeth in it, and owneth the King, though in some acts he disobey? Nor doth every Boy that is faulty, separate from the School.

VII. Is he a greater Separatist that confesseth you to be a true Church, and your Communion lawful, but preferreth another as fitter for him; or he that denieth Communion with true worshiping assemblies as unlawful to be Communicated with, when it is not so. If the former, then Condemning you as no Church is a diminution or no aggravation of Separation, and the Local presence of an Infidel or a Scorner would be a less separate state, than the absence of your Friends. If the latter (which is certain) then if I can prove the Assemblies lawful which you condemn, you are the true Separatists that condemn them, and deny Communion with them, and declare such Communion to be unlawful. I Communicate with your Assemblies, and you utterly shun, refuse and condemn Communion with ours; which then is the Separatist, if I prove ours to be as good as yours?

VIII. Many English Doctors say, *Rome* is a true Church, as a Knave or Thief is a true man, and we separated not from It, but they cast Us out for doing our duty, and not sinning as they do. I say not as they (for as the Pope claimeth the Headship of the Church Universally, that form of Policy is not of God, and we separate from that essential form of their pretended Church:) But *ad hominem* if the Diocesane also be a true Church, and we cast out of it for not sinning, are We separatists, or are our Ejectors such?

IX. I have shewed you that the *Canons* Excommunicate *ipso facto* all that say the imposed Conformity is unlawful. If this be unjust, is it *Separation* to be so Excommunicated? and who is the Schismatick here? And what shall be thought of such Church men as will first *ipso facto* Excommunicate us for our duty, and then as

you do call us Separatists. Would you have Excommunicate Men, Communicate with you? I (and many) do so, because you shall be the Executioners of your own sentence, and not I: But with what face can men cast Men out by Canon *ipso facto*, and then revile them for not coming in. You can mean no other in common sense, but that we are Schismaticks or Separatists, because we are not of the Conformist's judgment: And that is not in our power: And you differ more in judgment in greater matters from each other; and yet call it not Schisme or Separation. Yea you differ about the very essential form of your National Church, one part taking it to be the Kings supremacy, and another to be the Bishops or Clergy's Power: And therefore you cannot be truly of one National Church, that are not for one essential Form.

X. If men be wrongfully Excommunicate, are they thereby absolved from all publick Worshipping of God? or do they lose their Right to all Church-Communion? I have else-where cited you Canons enow that say the contrary, and that *Clave Errante* the Excommunication hurteth none but the Excommunicator: And I have Cited Bishop *Tailor*'s Full Consent. Must we not then Meet and Worship as we can, when you wrongfully Excommunicate us?

XI. Are not the *Laity*, by your Canon, forbidden to Receive the *Sacrament* in another Parish? or, any other to receive them, if they dare not Receive it from a Non-Preaching Minister at Home? And if the People judge, that he that is unable or unwilling to Preach, or that is a *Heretick*, or that liveth in such heinous Sins, or Preacheth Malignantly, as to do more Harm than Good, may not lawfully be owned by them for *Christ*'s Ministers, nor their Souls be Committed to their Pastoral Trust; Must they therefore be without a Pastors Care, or all Publick Worship and Communion, and be Condemned for being Wronged?

XII Were all those Councils *Separatists*, that Decreed, That none shall hear Masses from a Fornicating Priest? And, Were the Canons called the *Apostles*, and the *Greek*-Church that used them, for Separation, that said, [*Episcopus ignorantiâ aut malo animo oppletus, non est Episcopus, sed falsus Episcopus, non a Deo, sed ab hominibus promotus?*] Was *Gildas* a Separatist that told the *Brittish* Wicked Priests, That they were not *Christ*'s Ministers, but Traitours? and that he was not *Eximius Christianus*, that would call them Priests, or Ministers of *Christ*? Were *Cyprian*, and all the *Carthage-Council*, Separatists, that wrote

wrote the Epiſtle about *Martial*, and *Baſilides*, which I Tranſlated; and told the People, It was their Duty to Separate from *Peccatore Præpoſito*, a Scandalous Prelate? and that the Chief Power was in them, to Chooſe the Worthy, or Refuſe the Unworthy? and that they were guilty of Sin, if they joyned with ſuch Sinners? Who made *You* a more Reverend and Credible Judge of Separation, than *Cyprian*, and this *Council?* At leaſt, Who will think, that you may Judge them *Separatiſts*, or guilty of *Schiſm?*

XIII. Are not the *Laiety*, by your Canon to be denied the *Sacrament*, if they be not *willing of your Epiſcopal Confirmation?* And when *Impoſition of Hands* is made the *Sign* by which *Confirming* or *Aſſuring Grace* is conveyed, and ſome Biſhops aſſign no leſs to it; they fear, leſt it be made a *Sacrament*. Be their Doubts juſt or not, they cannot overcome them. And, Muſt they therefore Live without *Sacramental* Communion? By what Law?

XIV. Are not the *Laiety*, that dare not Receive the *Sacrament* Kneeling, for the Reaſons elſe-where mentioned, to be denied the *Sacrament* by your Rule? And though herein they fear Sin more than they have cauſe, Muſt they that cannot Change their own Judgments, live all their Days without the *Sacrament?* When as *General Councils* Decreed, That none ſhould Adore Kneeling on any Lord's Day, and the *Church* for a *Thouſand* Years, practiſed accordingly; Are all *Separatiſts*, that dare not do that in ſuch an Inſtant, which they judge to be flat Sin; nor yet did caſt off *Sacramental Communion?*

XV. When the *Laiety* cannot have their Children Baptized, without ſuch Uſe of the Tranſient Dedicating Image of the Croſs, and ſuch Uſe of Entituling and Covenanting *God-Fathers*; which, on the Reaſons largly given by me, they take to be no ſmall ſin; Is it Separation to joyn with Paſtors, that will otherwiſe Baptize them? Are they bound to ſin againſt their Conſciences, or to leave their Children Unbaptized? or, Prefer ſuch Paſtors as Refuſe them?

XVI. Is it Separation for men to Refuſe Paſtors that are Uſurpers, and have no true Power over them? Sure it is not to Refuſe an Uſurper of the Kingly Power? and, Why then of the Church-Power? Which of the Biſhops thought it any Sin, in the Dayes of Uſurpation, to forſake their Pariſh-Churches? And in my *Abridgement of Church-Hiſtory*, I have cited many Canons, which prove it the Common Judgment of the Church for *One Thouſand* Years, or near; That he was no Biſhop,

that was not Chosen by the Clergy, and the People; or came in, without the Peoples Consent. And if you will Read a late Treatise of Father *Paul Servita* of *Venice* (a very Venerable Author) you will see this at large Confirmed. And, If this be true, Is it Schism to take such for none of our Pastors? And Patrons choose Pastors for the peoples Souls, who too often care not for their own: Yea, though they believe not that Man hath an Immortal Soul, their Power of Electing those that Men must take for the Guides of their Souls, is nevertheless for their Infidelity. What Law of God bindeth all Men to stand to their Choice? How many Hundred Congregations have Incumbents, whom the People never consented to; but take them for their Hinderers and Burden?

XVII. *Dispositio materiæ necessaria est ad Receptionem formæ: non ex quovis ligno fit Mercurius.* If a Person be uncapable of the Ministerial Office, it is no Sin to Judge him no Minister. Those are Uncapable, 1. Who have not tolerable Ministerial Knowledge and Utterance. 2. Who are *Hereticks*. 3. Who malignantly Oppose serious Religion as Hypocrisie, or a needless Thing. 4. Who, by their wicked lives, do more Hurt than they do Good. From such, St. *Paul* bids Men *Turn away*; that have a Form of Godliness, but deny the Power. Is it *Schism*, to Obey such Commands? And how great a Number of such Cases there are, I need not tell the People.

XVIII. I am loth to displease you; and I write not to Accuse *You*, or other *Conformists*. But as *Paul* was constrained by Accusers, to speak sharply of them, and like a Fool (though not Foolishly) of himself: So you constrain us to say that in our own Defence, which will exasperate you; and, I doubt, you cannot easily bear. And God saith, *Thou shalt not Hate thy Brother in thy Heart: Thou shalt in any wise Rebuke thy Neighbour, and not suffer Sin upon him.* I have told you only, how many and heinous the Sins are, which we fear we should be Guilty of, should we Conform. The *Thirty* Aggravations named *Sect.* 16. are Tremendous. We have yet heard from none of you, any thing which should excuse us from such Guilt, if we did Conform. And if the People think, (though they should mistake) that all the *Conformists* are Guilty of the like: Can ye wonder, that they Prefer less Guilty Pastors, to trust the Conduct of their Souls with? when *Heb.* 13. they are Commanded to be Followers of their Guides? If they mistake, [1 *Cor.* 5. *With such not to Eat,*] and, [*From such turn away*] Is it Intolerable?

But

But bear with needful Truth, as to your self. You here would dissuade the *Nonconformists* from their Publick Ministry, and Plead it to be their Sin; By this you own the Silencing and Alienation of about *Two Thousand* such Ministers, till they Conform. I ask't you formerly, is it not Sacrilege, to Alienate (unjustly) Devoted, Consecrated Persons, and worse than to Alienate Lands or Monies? And, is it not a *Hindering of God's Word?* for which the *Liturgy* dissuadeth Men from the *Sacrament*, lest the *Devil enter into them.* I only say, *If Men be Guilty of this*, (which *You* think, the *Nonconformists* are, by not Conforming; and *They* think, *Others* are.) If you had Robbed *Thousand* Churches of the Communion-Plate, or the Glebe-Land, or Consented to the Doing of it: were it Separation and Shism for your Parish to prefer another Pastor of their own Choice? And when you Publish your Consent to the Alienating or Silencing about *Two Thousand* such Ministers, If Men think that you do much worse than a *Thousand* Church Robbers, though they should mistake, Is not their Trusting another Pastor with the Conduct of their Souls, a tolerable Thing? Dear *Brother*, Try to take off the Byas of your Judgment, and bear with necessary Truth, though rough. Though your *Logical Faculty* run lamentably Low in this your Accusing *Sermon*, I impute it to the Badness of your *Cause*. Undoubtedly, you have Learning enough, to know that ye must Die! and that after *Death*, *Judgment* must be expected; and that the Time is short; and the Fashion of these deceiving Worldly Things, doth pass away. And, Can you think, that your Approbation and Endeavours to Silence so many such Ministers while your own Experience might tell you, That *even You* do need much Help in such a Charge as you undertake, will be the Matter of a Comfortable Account? If you think so, I must say, That a little sober, impartial, believing Consideration, will make a Man Wiser, than the Reading of many Books with an unhumbled, byassed Mind. The Day is coming, when you shall see, that ye were in a better, safer way; when with peaceable Dr. *Tillotson*, you seemed to Consent to the Plat-form of an Act for our Concord and Restoration? which made me tell many Parliament-Men, [*Refer our Cause to the Council of Dr.* Tillotson *and Dr.* Stillingfleet, *and we shall presently be Healed.*] But, What is Man? And, What need have we to pray, *Lead us not into Temptation?* Sinful

XIX. If Men know the need of the full Use of the Pastoral-Office for their Souls, and cannot spare it, and yet live where-

where they cannot Enjoy one Half or Quarter of it; Is it Schism for them to seek to Enjoy the rest? Dr. *Hammond*, in his *Annotations*, oft tells us, *That the Office of a Bishop, was, To Preach, To Direct Mens Consciences, To Visit and Pray with the Sick, To take Care of all the Poor, and the Moneys gathered for them, To be their Guide in Publick Worship, To Exercise* Christ's *Discipline, Admonishing, Rejecting the Obstinate, Restoring the Penitent, Strengthening the Weak, Comforting the Afflicted, Resolving the Doubtful, Convincing Gain-sayers*, &c. Some of your most Peaceable Conformable Hearers tell me, [*We have need of a Frequent Help, by the Company and Councel of a Pastor.*] But we never see him, but in the Pulpit. And if we should all go to seek him in another Parish where he dwells, when ever we need a Pastor's Councel, were he at Leisure and willing, he could not have time to speak to one of an Hundered, that might (at once) wait to speak with him: So that, we have none of this necessary Pastoral Help, when we greatly need it. Yea, not the Sixth, or Tenth Part of the Parish can come to Hear him in the Church. And when We that most desire it get in, it troubleth us to think, that we thereby keep out those that least desire it, but most need it: who knowing the Difficulty of getting Room, do stay at Home, and never seek it: So that, *Five* Parts of *Six* of our Neighbours, use not to go to any Church at all, no more than Infidels. And if in pity we perswade them to go to any *Nonconformist*'s Meeting, they say the Clergy will Damn them as *Schismaticks*. The Question now is, Whether *Ten Thousand, or Twenty Thousand* in a Parish, are bound to live without all Private Pastoral Help and Councel; yea, and to forbear all Publick Worshipping of *God*, and Hearing of his *Word?* And, if they seek Relief of *Nonconforming* Ministers, Publickly and Privately, Whether it be Sinful Separation? If Men can spare the Ministry, Why are they Maintained? If they are needful for the Safety of Mens Souls, Must so many *Thousands* hazard their Souls for want of needful Help, lest they be called *Separatists?* If the Dean of St. *Pauls* be called the *Parson of the Parish*, and Preach to others that can Hear him, Will that serve the Needs of all the rest?

XX. In *Moscovie*, where a Christian Prince, and the Laws forbid all Preaching, and Publick Worship, save the Reading of *Homilies* and *Liturgies*; Is it Separation, and Sinful Schism, to Disobey this, and otherwise to Preach and Worship *God?*

XXI. Is it Schism in *France*, and such other Countries, for the

the *Proteſtants* to Meet to Preach and Worſhip *God*, againſt the Will of the *King* and *Biſhops?* It's true, that great Sin is neceſſarily thus avoided by *them*, which are not Impoſed upon *us*. But if it prove, that *any Sin* is made neceſſary to Communion, the Degree will not much vary the Caſe, as to the Point of Separation.

XXII. In divers Countries, the *Prince* is of one Religion, or Mode of Religion, and the *Biſhops* of another: The Queſtion is, Who are the Schiſmaticks, the People that in their Aſſemblies, and Mode of Worſhip, do follow the *Prince*, or they that follow the *Biſhops?* Some great Writers for Conformity tell me, That if the *King* Command one *Liturgy*, *Tranſlation*, *Verſion*, *Ceremony*, &c. and the *Biſhop* another, I muſt obey the *Biſhop* before the *King:* Others ſay, I muſt Obey the *King* before the *Biſhop*, (of which before.) Biſhop *Goodman* of *Gloceſter* (a *Papiſt*) complaineth of the *King*, that would not conſent that Clergy-Men ſhould be Chancellours: And I ſpeak with no Biſhop, that diſowneth not Lay-Chancellours Uſe of the Keys. The *Helvetian* Magiſtrates are *Eraſtians*, againſt the Clergies Power of Excommunication: Many of the Paſtors are of the Contrary Judgment. The Duke of *Brandenburgh* is a *Calviniſt:* His Biſhops and Clergy are *Lutherans*. Which Party are the *Schiſmatick?*

XXIII. Were all thoſe Separating *Schiſmaticks*, who, from the Apoſtles Dayes, did Meet, Preach, and Worſhip *God* againſt the Will and Laws of *Princes*; ſometimes of *Heathen Princes*, and ſometimes of *Chriſtians*; (*Conſtantine*, *Valens*, *Theodoſius* the Second, *Anaſtaſius*, *Zeno*, *Juſtinian*, &c.) If ſo, moſt Chriſtian *Biſhops* have been ſuch *Separatiſts*. I have in my *Firſt Plea*, and my *Church-Hiſtory*, given Inſtances enough.

XXIV. Is it *Schiſm*, or Sinful *Separation*, to Diſobey a Command about Religion, which no Man hath true Authority to Give? *Authority* is the *Objectum Formale* of *Obedience*; and where there is no *Authority*, there is no *Diſobedience*, in a formal Senſe, or privative. Moſt *Politicks* ſay, That *Princes* have no Authority againſt the Common Good: All Power of *Princes* and *Paſtors* is of *God*, and is for Edification, and not for Deſtruction. *God* giveth no Power againſt Himſelf, or his Laws, nor the Souls of Men. If the *King* ſhould Command me to Marry a Wife, whom I know to be intolerably unmeet for me; or to Feed my ſelf, and Family with Food, which I find to be againſt our Health; or to uſe a Phyſician, whoſe Ignorance or Negligence, or Untruſtineſs, would endanger my Life: I am

not

not bound to Obey him, both because it is a Matter that is *without* the Verge of his Governing Authority, and because it is against the End of Government. *Regal Power* destroyeth not *Family-Power*, nor *Personal Interest* and *Self-Government*: No Man hath Power to Destroy or Endanger the Souls of Men, nor forbid them seeking their own Edification and Salvation. I Repeat Bishop *Bilson*'s Words, p. 236 of Subjection: [*Princes have no Right to Call or Confirm Preachers; but to Receive such as be Sent of* God, *and give them Liberty for their Preaching, and Security for their Persons. And if* Princes *Refuse so to do*, God's *Labourers must go forward with that which is Commanded them from Heaven: Not by Disturbing* Princes *from their Thrones, nor Invading their Realms, as your Father doth, and defendeth he may do; but by mildly Submitting themselves to the Powers on Earth, and meekly Suffering for the Defence of the Truth, what they shall Inflict.* —— Pag. 399. *The Election of Bishops in those Dayes, belonged to the People, and not to the* Prince: *And though by plain Force, he placed* Lucius *there; yet might the People lawfully Reject him as no Bishop, and cleave to* Peter, *their Right Pastor.*] On this, I further ask,

XXV. If the Nonconforming People can prove, That (notwithstanding the times of Civil Usurpation, and *Bishops* Removal) their *Pastors* had a Lawful Call and Title to their Office over them, and they were truly obliged to them, as in that just Relation; Whether the Magistrates or Bishops Acts, have made those Relations, and Obligations Null? That the Temples and Tythes are in the Magistrates Power, we doubt not: But more than Bishop *Bilson*, even many Councils deny it of the *Office*, and *Pastoral Relation*. Yea, the Universal Church was of the same mind. And if so, how prove you, *e. g.* that the Relation of the Ejected *London* Ministers, and their Flocks was Dissolved, and that the Succeeders were true Pastors to the Non-consenting Flocks?

XXVI. That there are (Alas) Multitudes of Young, Raw, Injudicious, besides Scandalous *Priests*, no Man can deny that knoweth *England*, and hath any Modesty. If then honest People, that are not willing to be Damned, shall say: [*We best know what is suitable to our Needs, and what Teachers profit us, and what not. And we find that some are so Ignorant that they are unmeet as Plowmen, to resolve the most concerning Cases of Conscience; and their Conversation savoureth not of any serious belief of Christianity, and the World to come, and they do but*

but Read a few dry words, like School-Boys, saying a Weak Oration, without Life or Seriousness, and we can but little profit by them.] How prove you that it is lawful for such to use more suitable helps, though Men forbid it? A Soul is precious: God Worketh by means, and according to the suitableness of Means: That agreeth not to some, which others can make shift with: Two or Three words from a *Conformist*, that saith: [*God can Bless the weakest Means to you*; or, *the Fault is in your self*] will not serve instead of needful Helps. The *King* or *Bishop* have not Authority to tie a Sick Man to Eat that which he cannot Digest, or Hurteth him. Every Man is neerliest concerned for his own Soul, and most Entrusted with it. Parish-Order it self, is but a humane alterable Circumstance; which *I* am not bound to observe at the hazard of my Edification and Salvation.

XXVII. What if the Magistrate grant a Toleration of divers Modes of Worship, as the *French*, and *Dutch* Churches are her Tolerated, and many in *Holland*, and in many other Countries? Are these separating *Schismaticks*, that differ from each other? *If* so, it is not because they disobey the Magistrate; for he Tolerateth them all: if not, then meer diversity of Modes of Worship maketh not *Schismaticks*.

XXVIII. If it be no true Political Church (in the strict sense as an Organized Society,) which hath not true Authorized Pastors, and if any Parish have either *Uncapable Persons*, or such as were never Consented to by the Flocks, and so have no *True Pastor*; and if the Bishops hold, that Parishes are not proper Political Churches, but parts of Churches, having no Pastors that have the Power of the Keyes, or the whole Essence of the Pastoral Office; but only Half-Pastors, that want an Essential Part of the Power. *If* on any such Account, any Parishes are no true Pastoral Churches: *Query*, Whether to separate from such a Parish, be to Separate from a Church in the sense in question?

XXIX. The mutual Condemnations in the times of the *Novatians*, *Donatists*, *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, *Monothelites*, *Phantasiasts*, *Image-Patrons*, &c. tell the World how needful, mutual forbearance is, to prevent worse Divisions and Confusions: And the *Papists* take themselves to be all of one Church, though they differ even in Doctrines of Morality, as dangerously as the *Jansenists* against the *Jesuits* have shewed; and though many Sects and Orders be permitted to Live and Worship God with very great diversity in their several sorts of Monastaries:

Why then should the little differences of our questioned Assemblies, be thought to be so great as maketh us not to be of one Church.

XXX. Some good Christians think, That though an Undisciplined Church may be Communicated with, occasionally, yea, and constantly, while there is a hopeful Tryal of its Reformation; yet when there is no hope after Patient Tryal, a better Course and Communion should be chosen, where it may be had: And they think, that Multitudes whom they know to be prophane *Swearers*, *Cursers*, *Drunkards*, *Fornicators*, *Haters* of serious *Piety*, *Hobbists*, *Infidels*, *Atheists*, *Sadducees*, &c. are continued in the Church of *England*: And they say, they scarce ever heard one Man of all these Excommunicated; nor one Man of them all, ever brought to Publick Confession and Repentance. And they think, Lay-Chancellours, having not rightfully the Power of the Keys, there is no ordinary Means of hopeful Reformation, and Exercise of Discipline; especially, the Largeness of the Dioceses making it impossible to be used to One of an Hundred, that (according to the Law of *Christ*) it should be used on. And they think, That the Church-Discipline is not only *None*, as to the Right Use, and made Impossible; but worse than *None*, while it is used most to Excommunicate from *Christ*'s Church, the True and Conscionable Members of *Christ*, that dare not Conform; and so to lead to their Imprisonment, and utter Ruin. And they think, That no Man hath true Authority, to confine them to such an Undisciplined, and Ill-disciplined Church; and forbid them the Use of better, where *Christ*'s Discipline may be used. Whether these Men be in the Right, or in the Wrong, if the Matter of Fact be true, I should desire rather the Reformation of such a Church, than the Reproach or Afflicting of Men, as *Separatists* and *Schismaticks*, that choose another sort of Communion, as to their more Ordinary Practise; not denying this to be a true Diseased Church.

And so much in these *Thirty* Instances, about that which *I* think deserveth not the Reproach of any dangerous Separation. *I* told you *Thirty* Instances also of Unlawful Separation, which I named. And now you may judge, whether you spake to Edification, when you said, That [*the People are Condemned by their own Teachers*;] without telling, whom, and for what; and how far they Condemn them, and how far not.

§. 34. And, Did you think the Consequence good, That because we think it *Lawful to Hear you*, yea, and to many a *Duty*;

ty; therefore we Condemn them, for *Hearing any one else*, that Conformeth not? As if they that have Communion with your Diocesan-Church, must have Communion with no other? So far am *I* from your Opinion, that *I* take it to be wofully Separating and Schismatical: And will never be a Member of a Particular Church, which will forbid me Communion with all others that differ from them; yea, that do not hold its Communion in Unity with all the True Christian Churches on Earth. Though a Schismatical Disputer for Prelacy, tells me, *That though I communicate with the Church of* England, *I am a Schismatick for communicating with* Non-conformists, *who* (saith he) *are Schismaticks*. But he that will communicate with no Church that hath any Guilt of Schism, when the Christian World is broke into so many Sects, *I* doubt, will be the greatest Schismatick; and will Communicate with few on Earth And as *Smith* Baptized himself, not liking any other Baptism, this man may become a Church unto himself.

And indeed, the word [*Condemn them*] sounds Harsh; when it signifieth no more than that we *Judge them to be Mistaken and Culpable*. if *I Condemn* every Man, or every Church, which *I* judge to be Sinners, *I* must *Condemn* all Mankind. *I* use not so harsh a Phrase of your Self, as to say, *I Condemn You*: When yet *I* judge your Book to be more Schismatical, than the Meetings of most that *I* am acquainted with; which you Accuse.

§. 35. But yet, your Mistake is Greater than *I* have hitherto mentioned. *I* know not *many* (if *any*) that use to Hear Me, who Seperate from You: Many of them are *Episcopal*, and for your *Liturgie* and *Ceremonies*. I think, most of them go to the Parish-Churches; and *few* (if *any*) that I know, do deny it to be Lawful. How then can you prove it True, that we *Condemn* them? What is it for? Is it because they neither Separate from the *Conformists*, or *Nonconformists*? This is it, that we Exhort them to. It was an ill Slip, to put our *Condemning them*, for *Commending them*: But a fair Exposition will make it Lawfull.

§. 26. But you say [*How they can Preach lawfully to a people that commit a fault in hearing them, I do not understand.*]

Ans. Now you come to your business: But 1. What if you by Calumny call my ordinary hearers Separatists, and they are not such? 2. What if we prove it to be their duty to hear both you and us in season, if they need it, or lawful at least; and so do commend them, and not condemn them? may we then lawfully

Preach to them? What if the fault which we blame some for, be their judging it *unlawful to hear such as you*? Will your Logick prove that we call it their *fault to hear us*; as if *hearing us*, and not *hearing you*, were words of the same signification?

And is all necessary which is *lawful*? Do we condemn men that do not all that is *lawful* to do? And because you after infer, that *if it be lawful, it is a Duty*; *I* would you had told us, whether you take this universally, that [*Whatever is lawful is a Duty*,] or only in this case for some special reason, and what that is. *I* suppose it is, because it is commanded: as if every *lawful* thing commanded were a duty: But we think otherwise, unless the Command be an Act which God Authorizeth the Commander to do. All mens Authority is limited by God: and they have none but from him. For instance, it is lawful to eat brown Bread, and drink Water, (or Wine;) But if the King or Bishop forbid me to eat better, when my health requireth it, *I* am not bound to obey them; it is lawful to wear Sackcloth, but none have power to forbid me fitter cloathing: It is lawful to set a Son Apprentice to a *Chimney-sweeper*, or to an *Ale-seller*, or *Vintner*; but if the Bishop or any other forbid one to place him better, it obligeth not: It is lawful to marry a *Blackmore*, or an ugly Scold, or Beggar: But the Bishop or King cannot oblige men to chuse no better, because it is out of the Verge of their jurisdiction, and belongeth to personal and family power. It is lawful to put my self into the Hospital, and care of an unskilful Physician, till my health require better: But when my health requireth it, *I* will use a better if *I* can, whoever forbids it. For it is usurpation in them, that shall take the necessary care of my health and life out of my own hands. *It* is lawful to give the King our estates: But Lawyers say we are bound to do it, meerly because He or the Bishop commandeth it.

But perhaps you think, that men may do more against our souls than against our bodies; and have more power in Religion than in civil and bodily things: But we are not bound to think so if you do. It is lawful for men to hear one that only readeth the Scripture and Liturgy, and never preacheth: But when my needs requireth more, *I* will use it if *I* can, whoever forbids me. *It* is lawful to hear an ignorant raw Lad, that saith over a dry Sermon as a Boy saith his Lesson, and hath neither Spiritual Life nor Light, nor is fit to take a Charge of Souls: And it is lawful to hear such a Sermon as yours, or one that preacheth against other mens preaching: Yea, we rejoyce, and will rejoyce that Christ is preached, though by such as do it in strife and contention

to

to add affliction to the afflicted, and not sincerely: But wise men that believe a life to come, and love their souls, will choose better if they can, whoever forbiddeth them. Men have no power to hurt our souls, nor to deprive us of the help which God affordeth us, nor to make themselves the only Judges, what is profitable or hurtful to our souls or bodies, or what is best for our edification.

§ 37. But [*To commit a fault in hearing us*] is of doubtful signification. In the manner of hearing, all commit faults; by some defect of attention, faith or application: But that's not it that you mean: But that *it is their sin to hear us* And indeed, if this were true, is it above your learning to understand, that it is lawful to preach to them that commit a fault in hearing them.

1. What if culpably they would hear no other? Is it better let them hear none at all, than that we preach to them? If peevishness or sickness make a Child refuse the Food or Physick which he should take by his parents command; will you say, that it is better that he famish or die, than that you give him any other? Men may be saved that hear not you: But how can they believe, unless they hear, or hear without a Preacher? The means is for the End: *I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*, is a Lesson which I perceive more than the *Pharisees* are to learn. Order is for the thing Ordered: Parish Order is not so needful as Faith and Salvation. It may be, such a mans Sin, that he will not hear such as he should hear; and so by Consequence that he heareth me, and yet also Consequently his Duty to hear me, supposing that his fault hath blinded him, to think that he may hear no other, till his Errour be Cured: Or at least, it is my Duty to take him as I find him, and Preach to him in his own mistake.

2. The Canon forbids going out of our own Parishes: suppose *twenty or five Hundred* Infidels, or Papists of the next Parish resolved, we will hear no Protestant but Dr. *Stillingfleet*; were it unlawful for you to Preach to them?

3. If I should Preach to them all against separation, and for Prelacy, were it unlawful? One of the Doctors at the *Savoy*, 1661. motioned, that he and I might go up and down *England* to Preach for Conformity: and if any ask us why we do not, we may tell them, Dr. *Stillingfleet* taketh it for unlawful: If it be a Sin to preach to them, it is a sin to preach to them against Separation, or for Conformity.

4. It is ordinary for men of other Parishes to hear you, and Dr. *Tillotson*, and others, such as you esteem: And I suppose

most weekly Lectures are Preached most to men of other Parishes, and yet you take it not for sin to preach to them.

5. It is ordinary for many Protestants to go hear and Communicate with the *French* or *Dutch* Churches which differ from you in the Mode of Worship: And yet I never heard it proved, that it is a sin for the Preachers thus to preach to them.

6. What if your Children as Prodigals over-run you, or the Kings Subjects causelesly fly into another Land: They ought not to be there. Is it therefore unlawful, for any to teach them there, or receive them to publick Worship?

7. Almost all the Christian World, is so tainted with some degree of Errour and Partiality, that men will hear none but those of their own mind, for their Errour sake. The *Armenians*, *Abassims*, *Grecks*, *Papists*, *Nestorians*, *Jacobites*, *Lutherans*, *Arminians*, *Calvinists*, *Anabaptists*, &c. It is unlawful for any of these, to refuse sounder Teachers than their own, and to Confine themselves to their own only meerly for their singular Opinions: And yet it will be hard for you to prove, that all the Preachers on Earth, must give over Preaching to any such as these. What shame, Blood, and odious Schisms, followed this Schismatical Principle, while in doubtful Disputions, or tolerable differences, each party Condemned and Cursed the other, I have fully manifested in my Abridgment of Church-History. While by one Emperour and Council all the Orthodox were Deposed; and by another, all the *Nestorians*; and by another, all the *Eutichians*; and by another, all the *Monothelites*; and by another, the *Corrupticolæ*; and by another, the *Iconoclasts*; and so on; How few were there un-Cursed, and un-Condemned in the Roman World? And this keepeth the Churches in Schism to this day.

8. Do not you thus teach the Non-conformists to requite you with the like; and by your own Rule to judge it unlawful for you to Preach. They judg indeed, that it is lawful to hear you; 1. When better cannot be had, without greater hurt than benefit. 2. To shew their judgment by their Practise, *viz.* that they separate not from you as no Church, nor take it for simply unlawful to have Communion with you: But they that think Conformity as great a sin as they have told you, they fear it would be to them, must needs think that it is a fault in those that choose your Assemblies, when *cæteris paribus*, and without greater hurt than good, they might have better. And must we therefore conclude, that it is unlawful for you to Preach. Suppose it were but, when we had the Kings Licence. Or, if in the times of

Usurpation

Uſurpation, any thought to leave the Pariſh Churches tended culpably to Diviſion: It followeth not, that is was unlawful for a Biſhop to preach in private, though when you, under the Uſurpers, kept the Pariſh Church, he had preacht to ſome of your Flock.

But here you ſhew what your Labour tendeth to, *viz.* To prove it Unlawful for us to Preach, that you may perſwade Us to give over. *If God* will, I ſhall elſewhere give you an Account of the Reaſons of our Preaching; and Anſwer what You, and Others ſay againſt it: And therefore, ſhall ſay but little of it here. But I am heartily ſorry, that you are come to ſuch a Deſire: That you had rather ſo many *Hundred* ſuch Miniſters were Silenced, than ſuffered to Preach without your Covenants and Ceremonies! That you no more regard the Needs of the People, that abound in Ignorance, Careleſneſs, and Vice; nor obſerve no more the Power of Sin, nor the great Want of Help to ſuch Pariſhes, as your own, and too many in the Land, that have need on other Accounts.

O! How dreadful and unſearchable are the Judgments of *God*? That when ſo many *Hundreds* were Forbidden to Preach the Goſpel, the Plague muſt firſt give them ſome Degree of Liberty, and the Flames continue it the next Year, and the *King*'s Clemency after, and Horrid *Popiſh* Treaſon next divert their Proſecutors; while the Laws and Biſhops all the while forbad them: Even when the Pariſh-Preachers fled from the Plague, and it was dying Men that the *Non-Conformiſts* Preach't to. And when the Churches were Burnt down, and the People had no Prieſt, or Place to go to for their own way of Worſhip; yet neither Laws nor Biſhops conſented to our Preaching: And ſuch Men as Dr *Stillingfleet* alſo, come in to engage their Wit, Reputation, Induſtry, and Conſcience, in the Silencing Deſign. O! What Cauſe have we all to Watch and Pray, That *We enter not into Temptation*? and to dread the Spiritual Judgments of *God*? *Remember* Lot's *Wife*, was a needful Warning. A *Solomon*, that is Numbred with the Wiſeſt Men, may be ſet up as a Frightful Monument, to bid us *Take heed, leſt we Revolt*.

And *I* take it for a greater injury to us, to perſwade us to Silence our ſelves; than to perſwade the Magiſtrate only, to Silence, Baniſh, or Impriſon us: For ſo to Suffer from another, is not our Sin. But Sacrilegiouſly to break our Miniſterial Vow, and forſake the Calling, which we were Solemnly Vowed to, and this

this while the Necessity of Souls for Help; is a Sin, which few Men are so bad, as to perswade us to with open Face, without some pious fraudulent Pretence.

§. 38. Serm. p. 20. [*I do not confound bare Suspending Communion, in some particular Rites, which Persons do modestly Scruple, and using it in what they judge to be Lawful; with either total, or ordinary Forbearance of Communion, in what they judge to be Lawful; and proceeding to the Forming of Separate Congregations*, i. e. *under other Teachers, and by other Rules, than what the Established Religion alloweth. And this is the present Case of Separation, which I intend to consider, and to make the Sinfulness, and the Mischievousness appear.*

Answ. I am sure, I am one that you expresly Charge, as of this Number; and *I* can best speak for my self and those of my Acquaintance. 1. *Is* it true, that I *totally* or *ordinarily* forbear?

2. What mean you by [*Forming*] *a Congregation?* If their *Presence* be my *Forming* them, it is but because I speak to them: For, I neither Perswade nor Drive them to be there. But if you mean, *Forming* them into a *Distinct Church*, and becoming their *Pastor*, *I* was never Related as a *Pastor*, to any *Church*, but *Kidderminster*; nor have these Twenty Years, been a *Pastor* to any; but borrowed other Mens Pulpits, to Preach a Lecture to such as say they need it.

3. Your word [*Separate*,] *I* have Examined before. You Separate from My Auditory, and more than Separate; and *I* Separate not from Yours: Who then is the *Separatist*?

4. All the Parishes about you, and the Bishop of *Ely* in your Parish, that judge it Lawful to Hear you, yet are Absent from you; and so are some *Non-Conformists*, that think they must Preach themselves; and cannot be in two Places at once. *Is* that Separating?

5. The *French* and *Dutch* Churches do all that, which you here describe, as *Sinful* and *Mischievous*; only they have more Leave, than we.

6. *Is* all the matter, that *We are Teachers, which the Law alloweth not*? So were the *Orthodox* under the *Nestorian*, *Eutychian*, *Monothelite*, &c. Princes. And so *I* have proved That the Christian Religion hath been much propagated in the World.

7. What are the *Rules* which we go by, which the Established Religion alloweth not? Doth it not allow the *Sacred Scriptures?*

Scriptures? Or, Have you proved, That *I* go by any other *Rule*? If the *Act of Uniformity*, or the *Canons* be your Religion, Do not they allow *God*'s Word? Or, if they be your *Rules*, *omitting that*, Is not *Using another*? Yet, those that do joyn in Churches under Chosen Pastors, when I do not, *I* shall not Condemn till I hear their Reasons: They may have more Cause than *I* have.

§. 39. Serm. p. 21. [*They Unanimously confess they find no fault with the Doctrine of our Church.*]

Ans. 1. And yet are you one that would have them all Silenced? But this is not true: You name *Four* or *Five*, and then say [*Unanimously*;] and this because they offer to Subscribe the Doctrine of the *Thirty Nine* Articles; and yet *I* suppose you know, they more Unanimously dissent from the Doctrinal Article in the Liturgy of *Baptized Infants*, certain *undoubted Salvation* without Exception, and some of them to the *Doctrinal Damnation* of all Condemned in *Athanasius* Creed; And some of your selves, as well as Mr. *Humphrey* could wish the Article against *Free-will*, and that which Damneth all the Heathens, and some others, had been otherwise than they are.

§. 40. [*They generally yield, that our Parochial Churches are true Churches; and it is with these that Communion is required.*]

Say you so? 1. The *Diocesans* are little beholden to you, if this be all! Do you require no Communion with them?

2. *I* think *I* shall shew you anon, that you take your Parishes for no true Churches your self: At least your chief Brethren do not, who make them but parts of a Church, the *Diocesan* being the lowest proper Church.

3. Are you sure, that the *Independents* take your Parishes for true Churches? *I* cannot tell. But *I* know *John Goodwin* and Mr. *Brown* have Writ to the Contrary.

4. And for my self, how oft have *I* told you, that *I* distinguish, and take those for true Churches, that have true Pastors (but that is, because *I* judge of their office by Gods Word, and not by the Rule which depriveth them of an essential part of the Office of a Pastor of a true Church.) But *I* take those for no true Churches, that have. 1. Men uncapable of the Pastoral office. 2. Or not truly called to it. 3. Or that deny themselves to have the Power essential to a Pastor. Such Congregations *I* can joyn with, as Chappels or Oratories: But they are

not Churches of the political organized form which we speak of, as wanting an essential part.

§. 41. Next you tell men, what I said in print, of our *Conclusion, that communion with you* was lawful.] *Answ.* This is true: and when said we otherwise? Dr. *Manton*, Dr. *Bates*, Dr. *Jacomb*, Mr. *Poole* and others were there! I told you before, how *far lawful.*

§. 42. Serm. p. 22. [*Who could have Imagined, but they should have all joyned with us, in what themselves judged to be lawful, and in many Cases a duty. But instead of this, we have rather since that time, found them more inclinable to courses of Separation*, &c.]

Answ. If this be not true, I take it not for sinless. Since that time 1. Mr. *Pool*, Mr. *Humphrey*, my self and others, that took our selves to be no Pastors to any particular Church, have usually joyned in your assemblies; and I usually keep to my Parish Church.

2. Since that time, in a Treaty set on foot by the Lord-keeper *Bridgman*, we agreed *in terminis*, with Bishop *Wilkins*, and Dr. *Burton*; and Judge *Hale* drew up our Agreement into the form of an Act.

3. Since that time, at your own motion, we treated with honest Dr. *Tillotson* and you, and the same men and more, consented to the form and words of an agreeing Act, and you both seemed to consent.

4. Where you read my words, you might have read the Reason, why no more Communicated with you. And it is not like a lover of Truth to dissemble them; 1. I told you, that even at the present, new heats arising against Dissenters, we thought it our duty, till they were over, to forbear a lawful thing; which was like to occasion the sufferings of such as in that were not satisfied as we were. Marriage is lawful: But if it be not necessary, one may forbear it, if it would ruine another, though the Bishop command it him. 2. I told you, that the *Oxford* Act of confinement, came out when we were intending to come to your Churches: and then had we been seen there in the City or Corporations, we had been sent to Jayle: but many in the Countries came to your Churches. This is your Cathedral Justice; The Law is [*come to Church in London*, &c. and you shall go to Jayle six Months.] And if we do not, such as you tell the World, that we are Separatists. 3. I told you, men cannot preach to others, and hear you both at once. Must we repeat these things as oft as you accuse us?

§. 43. In

§. 43. In the charge are joyned Dr. *Owen* and my self, my error is [*p.* 24. *Serm.* 'That to devise new Species of Churches (beyond Parochial 'or Congregational without Gods authority, and to impose them on the 'world yea in his name) and call all dissenters Schismaticks, is a far worse 'usurpation than to make or impose new Ceremonies or Liturgies]

Ans. A man would think that this doctrine should justifie it self and confute the Accuser. 1. Will you own your Churches *de Specie* to be new, and yet appeal to antiquity? 2. Will you own them to be *devised without Gods authority*, and yet to be preferred to those that he instituted? 3. Will you own that yet *they may in his name be imposed* on the *World*? 4. And will you own that for these, *dissenters* may be called *Schismaticks*? 5. And is not this a worse usurpation than to make new Ceremonies? If you will plead for so much presumption, profanation of Gods name, usurpation, uncharitableness, and Schism, I will leave you to fight against the Light, and not labour in vain in a needless confutation. 2. But, Sir, you should have told your Reader the full truth. 1. That I never denied but largely asserted the Magistrates power of the Sword over all persons and causes Ecclesiastical, much less *Christian Kingdoms*, or Cities *de re*. 2. And that *I* maintained that Magistrates make officers to judge of the *Circa sacra*; or undetermined accidents of Religion. 3. And if you will equivocally call these Churches, I quarrel not *de nomine*. 4. Nor yet at the thing or name of the Association of many Churches for Concord. 5. But I say (in the Page cited by you) that as humane forms should not be pretended falsly to be Divine, so neither have they authority against those that are Divine, to change them and destroy their priviledges: Unless you will fight for man against God, you must reverse this Accusation.

§. 44. As to your case, of the extent of the first Churches, *I* have so much to say of it elsewhere, if God will, that I shall not here stay on so short a touch. Only you put me to repeat, *If God make families, and men make Cities*, do but consider the different efficients, and usurp not a power to destroy the power instituted by God, and we shall not much differ.

§. 45. You greatly strengthen my Cause by the testimony of so well Read a man [Serm. *p.* 27. 'Though when the Churches increased, the oc- 'casional meetings were frequent in several places; yet still there was but 'one Church, one Altar, and one Baptism, and one Bishop, with many 'Presbyters assisting him: And this is so very plain in Antiquity, as to the 'Churches planted by the Apostles themselves in several parts, that none but 'a great stranger to the History of the Church, can ever call in question.]

Ans. Bishop *Gunning* will give you no thanks for this, It seems after all the anger we are much agreed. I never denied Chapels to a Church, nor thought they must all meet at once. If they all meet

per vices at *one Altar*, they are associated for *presential Communion*, and not *distant* only, and this is that *I* am for. Make it but such a Church that meet at one Altar, and that can know one another, and are associated for such personal Communion in presence, and (though *I* could wish it neither too small nor too great) it is of the *Species* which *I* plead for as of God. There is certainly a Specifique difference between a Church that hath a Constitutive formal Governour, who hath the whole Pastoral power, and is associated for presential mutual help in faith, worship, and holy living, and one that either hath but a half Pastor without the power of the Keyes, or that is associated only for distant Communion, and never see each other; even for another Sort of Communion. Conformists hold that Bishops and Presbyters are distinct *orders*: Therefore Churches differing in the very *Order* or *Species* of the Constitutive Governours, and in the Triminus or end, and the nature of the Communions are certainly of distinct Species, and not only of distinct degrees in the same Species: But such are our *Parochial* and *Diocesan* Churches. Just such a Church as you here describe is it that *I* would have, and yet if the Chapels also have Altars, and there be more than one to the Church, as long as they are under the same Bishop and Presbyters, associate for Communion in presence, it alters not the Species.

§. 46. *I* thank you also for adding *p.* 28. [' *And yet this destributi-* ' *bution even in* Creet *was so uncommon in those Elder times, that* Epi- ' phanius *takes notice of it as an extraordinary thing at* Alexandria *and* ' *therefore it is probably supposed that there was no such thing in all the* ' *Cities in his time.*]

Ans. 1. It's true of *Creet*, which had an hundred Cities: But your [therefore] makes me think, you put *Creet* for *Cyprus*. For there it was that *Epiphanius* was a Bishop. 2. But you grant me the foundation of all my cause. Let the Diocess or Parish or Church (call it what you will) be no bigger than that the same Bishop may perform the true Pastoral office to them in *present* Communion, and not only by writs, and delegates, rule men that have no personal present Communion, nor ever intend it as the end of their relation, and *I* have my desire as to the Species of the lowest sort of Churches. 1 *Thes.* 5. 12, 13. *Know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you.* But such are not those whom we never saw nor heard, and never laboured among or admonished the twentieth or fortieth or hundredth Congregation in their Dioceses, and whom the People cannot know.

Heb. 13.7. *Remember them which have rule over you, who have spoken to you the word of God, whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation*

sation. 17. *Obey them that have the rule over you and submit your selves for they watch for your Souls as those that must give account.* But such are not they that the people never heard the word of God from, nor knew their conversation nor the men: And Bishop *Taylor* saith, *No man can give account of those that he knoweth not*; that is, Pastors account. Make Parishes true Churches, and restore them Church discipline, and we are satisfied.

'§ 47. *Serm. p.* 29. [*If we look over the ancient Canons of the 'Church, we shall find two things very plain in them: 1. That the notion 'of a Church was the same with that of a Diocess; or such a number of 'Christians as were under the inspection of a Bishop.*]

Ans. 1. Very true; and the Bishop was their ordinary Preacher, and only pronounced the blessing, *&c.* Therefore till the Species was altered it was like a School, whose Schollars lived in City and Country, but were under a Bishop that Governed them personally in presence. But after they were like many score or hundred Schools that had Teaching Ushers, and one absent Governour (to the most.) To Govern as a Schoolmaster in presence specifically differs from Governing as Princes or visitors, by Laws, or extraordinary inspection.

2. I pray you forget not that by this measure (if you hold to it) you unchurch all our Parish Churches: Every Church then had a Bishop, no Parish now hath a Bishop (proper to it self), or at least not many: Therefore no Parish (by this rule) is a Church. *Ecclesia est plebs Episcopo adunata.* You make no Church below a Diocess.

'§ 48. *Serm.* [2. *That those Presbyters who rejected the authority of 'their Bishop or affected Seperate meetings, where no fault could be found 'with the Doctrine of a Church, were condemned of Schism.*]

Ans. Good still: They were not to set up *altare contra altare*, but joyn with the Bishop in Governing the same Church in present Communion at least *per vices*: But if a Bishop then had put down a hundred or a thousand Bishops and Churches about him, and said, you shall be all but one Church in another sort of Communion, and I will be your only Bishop, Christians then would have abhored him: Now we have hundreds of Altars locally separated from the Bishop.

2. But yet if then the Doctrine of Faith had been never so sound, Christians would have Separated. 1. From unlawful Worship (specially Idolatry). 2. And from wicked Bishops; as the forementioned Epistle of *Cyprian* and the *Carthage* Counsel sheweth.

'§ 49. You Confess *Martin* and *Theognostus* Separation from the

Synods and Communion of the neighbour Bishops : And if it were not lawful for neigbours to communicate with them, I shall believe as *Cyprian*, that the same reason would at least warrant the people to forsake them, till you shew reason to the contrary. And you confess the *Joannites* separation, and only say that after they returned. It's true : But did they do well or ill before ? they returned not till gentleness and honouring *Chrysostome* reduced them : and though *Cyril Alex.* called them Schismaticks and said it was fitter the Church Canons should be kept, than such refractory Non-conformists gratified by restoring the honour of their ejected Pastor, yet *Atticus* had more wit and honesty then to follow his Counsel or be moved by his Threatning : Our Case hath ten times more to be said for it, than the *Joannites* had, who were not cast out, but departed, nor had any Impositions forced on them, which they took to be many hainous sins. Had you been impartial, you had easily seen this : But as *Cyril* and others accusation of the *Joannites*, as Separatists and Schismaticks, did not finally attain his ends against the *Joannites*, no more shall yours against the more excusable. In an Ale-house or Crowd of the debauched or ignorant [*They are Puritans, Presbyterians, Fanaticks, Separatists, Schismaticks, Hereticks, Rogues*] is effectual arguing and convincing, and some Preachers it seems take their hearers for such Judges ; But men will be men, and reason will be reason, and truth will be truth, and innocency will be innocency, and pride, and slander will shame their Authors more than the slandered, when you and I are dead and gone.

'§ 50. Serm. p. 30. [*But suppose the first Churches were barely Congregational by reason of the small number of Believers at that time, yet what Obligation lies upon us to disturb the peace of the Church we live in, to reduce Churches to their infant State.*] And here is mentioned the *Community of Goods*, *washing Feet*, and then [*They believe that the first Civil Government was appointed by God himself over families : Do they therefore think themselves bound to overthrow Kingdoms to bring things back to their first institution*, &c.]

Ans. 1. We call them not [*barely Congregational*] but [*associated for personal Communion*] If all the Kingdom had but one Bishop, that were another Species of Government and Communion than Parochial.

2. If one like you should plead for turning all the families in *London* into one, and making only one Common Father or Master of all families, who should send Stewards to every house, of his own making, to give them their victuals, he only being the proper Governour, and this man should plead as you do, that it is *disturbing the Peace of the great family*, to reduce them to their Infant State, by restoring

ſtoring particular families, more wit or reputation than yours would not keep his cauſe from ſhame. Or if he pleaded that all the Schools in a Dioceſs, or many 100 or 1000, ſhould have but one Schoolmaſter with Uſhers that have no power to take in or put out or uſe the Rod, and that to retrive this to the Infant ſtate is ſeditious, the reaſon of mankind would ſhame his reaſoning. And when men know *what Paſtoral Guidance* is, the caſe here will be as plain.

3. Our Reaſon for deſiring (not the Primitive paucity of Chriſtians, but) the Primitive form of Chriſt is. 1. Becauſe Chriſt by his Apoſtles inſtituted it: (Mr. *Thorndike* once ſpake well to that.) 2. Becauſe we can prove that he was faithful in forming his houſe and Church, as *Moſes* was in forming that of the Jews. 3. Becauſe we never heard it proved that man had power to alter what Chriſt by his Spirit in the Apoſtles founded: neither having their infallibility nor commiſſion. 4. At leaſt we think it is the ſureſt way to hold to that which we are ſure God ſettled, till we can prove that men have power to change the very form.

4. Teach us what to ſay to the Papiſts, when they ſhall accordingly ſay to us '[*What though there was no Univerſal Paſtor in the Primi-* ' *tive times? what though many things in diſcipline and worſhip be changed* ' *ſince? Why muſt you diſturb the peace of the Church by reducing things to* ' *the infant State? What though there were no Cardinals, nor General* ' *Councils of Prelates to make univerſal Lawes for the Churches, what* ' *though the Sacrament was given in both kinds, and there were no private* ' *Maſſes, or prayers for the dead? muſt the Church be ſtill in infancy? What* ' *though the Apoſtles inſtituted the Lords day for publick worſhip and holy* ' *Communion, may not the Church put that down, and ſet up one day of her* ' *making once a month or year inſtead of it?*

But I will not be one of thoſe that will *fight for man* againſt God; for I know who will overcome. If you can prove that Chriſt gave your Church authority to pull down the Church Offices and form which he appointed, and ſet up another, and call it the *Churches growth*, or emendation, I will obey them.

But I have elſewhere asked who they were that made your new Church form. If the firſt Church (of Gods making) it was only the *univerſal* headed by Chriſt, and particular Churches for perſonal Communion, if theſe made the new forms, tell us who, when, and by what power, and why they may not unmake them, if there be cauſe: and whether the efficient Church be not better then the effected: as the Parent than the Child. If you ſay that Biſhops of Pariſhes did it by conſent in *Aſia* or elſewhere above a thouſand years ago, how come we in *England* to be bound by them? If you ſay that Princes were the

makers

makers of the new *Church Species*. 1. Heathen Princes did it not. 2. The Bishops will give you little thanks, if you grant not that it was *done* before there were any Christian Princes to do it. 3. One Prince cannot make Laws for anothers Country. 4. Prove that ever Christ authorized Princes to change the Constitution of the Churches instituted by him, and make new ones above his form; except making officers for the *Circa Sacra* or variable accidents. 5. And what Princes do, they have power to undo.

And it concerneth us to enquire (much more then about ceremonies) how far this power of man extendeth. May they make as many new Church *Species* as they please? Why then may they not make as many forms as there are Kingdoms, if not an universal Pope by the consent of most?

5. But that which the Papists take for the Churches growth from Infancy, the Protestants take for its gradual depravation; And have written many treatises to shew when and how such corruptions were introduced: And the fore-mentioned book of *Paulus Sarpi Servita* lately translated, tells us by what degrees much of that evil did spring up, which some take to be the Churches Man-hood, and the amending of the defects of Christs institutions.

6. And you that wonder that I know not what you mean by [*the Church of* England] may next wonder that I know not what it is that you call [*the Protestant Religion*] In my [*Full Satisfaction*] I have told you that I mean by it, *simple Christianity expressed in the sacred Scriptures as the Recorded rule, with the rejection of all humane additions which suppose the Scriptures imperfect as to their regulating use:* But if you suppose that men may, without any Scripture proof of authority, take down and change the Church Species, which Christ by his Apostles made, and make new ones instead, and thus add to Christs Laws, equal, yea superior and derogating Laws of their own, this is not that *Protestant Religion* which I am of, and therefore I intreat you to define what it is you so call.

7. When you have as well proved the very essential form of the first Churches to have been instituted but *pro tempore* as a mutable thing, as we can prove the like of *washing Feet*, and *community* of *Goods*, we will submit. And so we will when you have proved that God that *made families* made not Cities or Republicks, that is, did not institute civil Government of many families; or that men who diversifie the forms of Republicks, may overthrow families or their proper power: Yea and that God hath left men as much power to make new *Species* of Churches, as to diversifie the Forms of Common-wealth.

8. And

8. And as to our [*disturbing your peace*] if you had built your frame on Christs foundation, and laid your peace on the unity of the spirit, and the seven particulars named *Eph.* 4. 45. 6. and had not built it on uncharitableness, on imperious usurpation, nor that love of the world, which *Paul Servita* saith brought in the Church corruptions, you would not have been so tender, nor your peace like an aspen leaf in the wind, as that your Brethren, who, you say, agree in Doctrine and the substance of worship with you, cannot quietly joyn near you in the worship of God, without your imposed words, and ceremonies, but they become disturbers of your peace. Its a sickly peace that is so easily disturbed by so small dissent. As *Rome* thinketh that all wrong her that do not obey her, and pleadeth for *Empire* under the name of Communion, so do some others; and will enter a suite against them as *Schismaticks*, that will not let them ride and lash them without complaint. If you have the humility and Charity of a Christian, without envy, *&c.* What harm doth it do you that I and such others worship God in another room, without your book, while your Church is as full as it can well hold? Do you not differ much more among your selves, as I before shewed? And the Papists yet more among themselves? and yet are in one Church, and tollerated. But so their *Power* and *Wills* may be obeyed, some men can bear with much more against God. Who heareth such out-cries against ten thousand or twenty thousands in a Parish that come not to any Church at all, as against a few Christians that pray and preach without your book? what Informers, what indictments, what prosecutions, what invectives are equally against all these aforesaid?

'§. 51. Serm. *p.* 31. [*It is very uncertain whether the Primitive form 'were such as they fancy*, &c. *but it is certainly our duty to preserve peace 'and unity amongst Christians*].

Ans. 1. Then it is certainly a sin to make racks to tear them, and make concord impossible, and say, none shall have Communion with us, that will not say and Swear what we bid them, and that think any thing sin which we impose; and to shut men out by Cannonical Excommunication, and then call them Schismaticks in Press and Pulpit not for coming in.

2. If it be *uncertain whether that which* we desire be the *Primitive form*, it is uncertain then whether you oppose not and fight not against the Primitive form.

3. What you say is uncertain I shall God willing prove certain elsewhere (and have done). All is not uncertain to others which is so to you.

4. Mark this, you that are for the *Divine right* of *Episcopacy as the Primitive form instituted by Christ*; As he taketh it for *uncertain* (as beyond Congregational forms), so were it so, if the Church should cast it out, he seemeth to hold your endeavours, to reduce it, to be a sinful breaking of the Churches peace. You are disturbers if in *Holland*, *Geneva*, *Helvetia*, you would reduce them to that which you suppose to be the Primitive form. *It may be it was but from the circumstances of the times*: And so the head of the Church hath made no particular Church *Species*, but left all to the better wit of men (who knows to whom).

'§ 52. Serm. [*It is impossible so to do, if men break all orders in pieces, 'for the fancy they have taken up of a Primitive* Platform].

Ans. *Anglice*, [It is impossible to *preserve Peace and unity among Christians*, if men will not suppose that Christ never instituted his own Church forms, or will not forsake his Institutions, but fancy that they must be conformable thereto, and will not prefer the wills and commands of Bishops to whom they never consented, and take it to be a breaking of all orders in pieces, not to do all that they enjoyn us, though we take it to be heynous sin, and will not give over Gods worship and our Ministry when they forbid us. *Dan. 6. We shall find no fault against this* Daniel, *except it be concerning the Law of his God*, but if he pray openly when forbidden, away with him to the Lyons for the Laws of the *Medes* and *Persians* are more inflexible than Gods.

§ 53. As to what you say of *preferring Morals* and the *ends* it is more truly than prudently mentioned as to your cause: For the *very* naming of it will make the Readers think, *whether your subscription and declaration and oaths* and imposed practices, which the Nonconformists judge unlawful, be greater matters than their preaching the Gospel, avoiding great sins, the concord and strength of the Protestant Churches, and the avoiding temptations to wrath, and persecution and divisions which will be bitter in the latter end. *Go learn what this meaneth I will have mercy and not Sacrifice*; (or needless Ceremony).

'§. 34. Serm. *p.* 42. [*Men may please themselves in talking of preserv-'ing peace and Love under seperate Communions: But our own sad ex-'perience shews the contrary: For as nothing tends more to unite mens hearts 'than joyning together in the same Prayer and Sacraments; so nothing doth 'more alienate mens affections, than withdrawing from each other into sepa-'rate Congregations*].

Ans. 1. But do all separate from you that are in other Parish Churches than yours? if not, do all separate that differ, as Cathredrals from

from Parish Churches, or as conforming *Preachers* do from one another? If not, do they separate that omit a form or ceremony of yours?

2. I am sorry, if you have experience of the *alienating of your affections* from your neighbours, that quietly worship God by you: but its like you know what you say: For my part many of them have said and written more against me, then against you, and, I thank God, I love them heartily; yea and that your own party from whom I have suffered far more. It is mens diseases that make them impatient of a cross opinion or word or censure, and then they cry out of mens unpeaceableness: As *Seneca* saith, *They that are sore complain if they but think their sore is touched.*

3. Let the Magistrates keep Peace and punish all that abuse their bretheren.

4. But we easily grant to you, that when men do not only differ, but fly from each others Communion as unlawful, it hath a great tendency to the alienations and evils which you mention. Had we not thought so, we had never stoopt, and pleaded, and begg'd of the Bishops to prevent or heal it as we did 1660, and 1661. And wo to the impenitent that are the cause of all, and to this day will not be perswaded by all the sad experience that they complain of.

Sir, instead of all your accusations and reasonings, it would have better dispatched all the business, would you but consider, *who it is that must cure the distance which you complain of?* I have fully proved to you in my book of *Concord that we are utterly unable to remedy* it. If you will not know, who can make you know. Do you think, that when you say to all the Land [*Say and do all that is imposed, or you shall not be admitted to our Communion*] that it is morally possible to make all good Christians agree in believing that it is all lawful? or to make them all do that which they think to be unlawful; I must freely tell you, that he that thinks that his own or any others reasonings will ever so far change all the truly honest Christians in the Land, knoweth to little of matters, men or Conscience, as that he is unmeet to be a Bishop or a Priest.

But is the remedy impossible to the *Imposers*? I am ashamed to debate the Question: But some men are so learned and wise, that they will not quench the fire in a City, nor save the Ship from sinking, nor forbear silencing Christs Ministers and scattering the Flocks, as long as they can but say, *There will such or such an inconvenience follow.* It would cost you *nothing* to cure all this, which it is impossible for us to cure. Therefore all your just aggravations of the mischiefs of schism or separation fall where it concerneth some of you to look to it, if you believe that there is a future Judgment; rather than to call your selves Schismaticks under the name of others, and put God and man to say, *Thou art the man.*

§ 55. *Pag.* 33. You come to me, for denying that I separate causelessly from the 'Communion of true Churches, or set up *Antichurches*, '[though (say you) they Preach when and where it is forbidden by Law, 'and administer Sacraments by other Rules and after a different manner than 'what our Church requireth: This is not dealing with us with that fairness 'and ingenuity which our former bretheren used —— they deny the fact which 'is evident to all persons: For do they not the very same things and in the 'same manner that the others do? How comes it to be then separation in 'some and not in others? They are very unwilling to confess a separation be-'cause they have formerly condemned it with great severity, and yet they do 'the same things for which they charged others as guilty of a sinful separati-'on.] And I am cited.

Ans. 1. This is like *H. Fowlis*; *The Puritans are the worst men on earth*: The Papists, are far prefer'd before them, *Because the Papists differ in fundamentals, but the Puritans take mass for a Ceremony.* So we are the most *disingenuous* and not *fair dealers*, that own them to be true Churches and Ministers and hold Communion with them; and yet deny that we are Schismaticks or separate: We leave you therefore, to treat with the lesser *disingenuous* and the fair dealers, that say you are no true Ministers, nor is it lawful to have Comunion with men that openly avow such hainous sin, and covenant against ever endeavouring to reform notorious Church corruptions: because with such we are forbid even to eat, and commanded from such to turn away; It's well you have some more ingenuous and fair dealers than I am.

But the disingenuity is my denying your accusation: I heard of a Gentleman that could silence any man: and his way was, he would accuse him (of Murther, Adultery, Theft or what his cause required) and if he denied it he would say; [*what will you make me a Lyar? To give me the Lie deserveth a stab.*] It is not only a crime if we do not *toto pectore telum recipere*, or with *Camero* unbutton our selves and say *feri miser*, or when ever we are beaten, confess that we deserved it: It's an odd kind of suit for a man that calleth an innocent man *traytor*, to bring his action against him, for saying, *you slander me.* But it is the name or thing that we must not deny. We will gratifie you in the first: I do separate from your Church, by half a miles distance, and by going to my own Parish, and by preaching my self, and so do most of the Parish Preachers, that will not sit hearing you when they should Preach. But it is *de re*. And what is it, First I must tell the matter of fact: I never took any pastoral charge these twenty years; gathered no Church: I never baptized one person: I never administred the Lords Supper once, in abou eighteen or nineteen years; but of late seldom to some few, since aged weak persons who were in my house

house, and near, who gave me special reason for it; and the Liturgy alloweth it to the sick and all their friends that joyn with them: while I lived at *Acton* and *Toteridge* I went twice each Lords day to the publick Church, even to the beginning: Here I go when I am able usually once a day to hear the Parson of the Parish; and I communicate with them in the Sacrament: I preach twice a week in another mans Pulpit (borrowed) most to strangers that I have no more to do with: My gain I thank them, the accuser put me not to excuse: I write and preach against Schism and all unjust separation, and perswade all to go no further from any than they go from Christ, or than they drive us away, or than we needs must, to avoid actual sin. Well; now what is the crime of separation?

1. I *preach* (you say) *when and where it is forbidden by Law.*] *Ans.* Is this the *formal reason of separation*? Then *disobedience* and *separation* are all one. I suppose you mean the Law of the King and the Parliament, and not the Canons, save as by them made Laws: when I had given you so many Historical instances of the ancient Bishops and Christians, doing the like, and justified commonly by the Church: did you think while you silently pass all that over, and all the rest that I said for my justification, that two lines of your saying was enough to confute all? Certainly it was not me that you meant to satisfie, nor any impartial man that had read my books. This dealing beseemeth, not so weighty a Cause. You seem to say [*All preaching when and where it is forbidden by Law, is sinful separation: But*, &c. I deny the Major. The Primitive Preachers did so for three hundred years: The Orthodox did so afterwards under *Constantius Valens*, *Theodosius* junior, *Anastasius*, *Philipicus*, *Justinian* and many more: The *Albigenses*, *Waldenses* and *Bohemians* did so: The Reformers did so: The Protestants when the Interim was imposed did so: *Episcopius* justifieth it at large, and the *Arminians* in *Belgia*, did so: The Martyrs in *England* and elsewhere did so. The Jesuits in the *East Indies* did so. But what if the Law forbad you to preach at a certain hour ---- do you separate from the Church, if you miss your hour? They that Preacht Afternoon Sermons when forbidden were taken for disobedient, but not for separatists. And what if when the Churches here were burnt the Ministers had read the Liturgy and preacht in a place forbidden by the Law: Had that been separation?

And how cometh [*when*] and [*where*] to be in, When we are forbidden *every time and in every place*, to preach to more than four? Is any *time* or *place* allowed us to preach in? You mean [*He is a separatist who preacheth being forbidden by Law:* But I am ready to give you a fuller proof than is now to be offered on this occasion, *that no man*

hath authority to forbid a faithful Minister of Christ, who forfeiteth not his Office-power, to perform the office to which he is ordained. And, Secondly, *that we remain under a Divine obligation to it, which such a Law cannot dissolve.* As Bishop *Bilson*, before saith] if Princes forbid us, we *must go on with our work*: what if the King had turned against Episcopacy and Liturgy, and forbad all the Episcopal to preach, Would you think it sinful separation to preach? By this you shew how easily you would lay down the work you are Vowed to, if the Law did but forbid you. How much than are Papist and Protestant Casuists mistaken, that say the Law is null that is against the common good, and that all power is only to edification.

And what limits do you set to this? Till you tell us, how can we judge of our separation: what If an interdict silence all the Ministers in a Kingdom, must all obey? What if it be most, must most obey? What if it be more then can be spared without the Churches wrong? And whose Laws be they that so binds us? Is it Infidel Princes or only Christians? Is it Papists, Arrians, Eutychians, *&c.* or only the Orthodox? And do you set the people all to judge whether the King be Orthodox, as the rule of their obedience to his Laws? If I prove not that God bindeth me to preach, call me disobedient, but yet that will not prove me a separatist.

By this rule you may be a separatist, as oft as the Law changeth, if you will not change as fast as it. Yea though you Judge the Laws impositions to be hainous sins, yet you must dothem all, or give over your Ministry: And so God must ask leave of the Rulers to be worshipped as God. If he were a God of their making, they might put him down.

And, *I* think, it will prove confusion and worse disobedience than our preaching is, to lay all the peoples obedience herein on their opinion of the Rulers Orthodoxness: no doubt, but the heathen and heretical Rulers are Governours even of the Church, though none hath power for destruction or against God. The Duke of *Brandenburghs* Subjects judge him not Orthodox: Are they therefore absolved from obeying him in matters of Religion? *Calvenist* Subjects think *Lutherane* Princes not Orthodox; and Protestants, in *France*, *Hungary*, *Poland*, judge their Papist Kings not Orthodox: Yea, what if we judge the Bishops not Orthodox that made the Cannons or Liturgy, are we absolved from obeying them? And what if any Subjects think that the King is not Orthodox? And Parliaments, who also make our Laws, contain men of many minds: And the Parliament of 1640. is said by the Bishops to have been far from Orthodox, even to have been Presbyterians and Erastians, and even for Rebellion; and yet they made

made divers Laws which the King consented to and ratified: Were not men obliged by those Laws? And indeed if the Law-makers being not Orthodox null his Laws about Religion, why not all his other Laws?

But it may be you will say, that it is not all the people that must judge whether the King and Parliament be Orthodox, but the Bishops for them. *Ans.* But who shall judge whether the Bishops be Orthodox? And if all be resolved into the implicite belief of the Bishops, why not of the civil Rulers as well? Or why not as the Papists on Pope and Councils?

I suppose to avoid all this you will not say, that he is a separatist that preacheth when forbidden by any Prince whatsoever, Turk, Heathen, Arrian, Eutychian, Idolater, Papist. Where then will you fix the notifying Character? All men are heterodox in some degree. How shall we know the degree which absolveth us from our obedience?

And how cometh an Orthodox man to be authorized to do mischiefs and forbid the needful preaching of the Gospel any more than a heretick? or a Christian more than a Heathen? I think he is bound to do more good then they, and not authorized to do more hurt. God never made him a judge whether the Gospel shall be preacht or not, nor whether the people shall be saved, or left to perish in their ignorance and sin.

Either then all are separatists that preach against the Laws of Heathens, Hereticks or Papists: And so the Orthodox Churches have in many or most Ages and places been separatists: Or else we are cast upon confounding impossibilities to know who the separatist is.

Especially in *Aristocracies* and *Democracies*, where the Rulers are of many minds, and the people can never know them all, nor when the Orthodox have the Major *Vote*.

And I would know, whether it be only Rightful Princes or also Usurpers, whose Laws are the bond of the Churches Unity. If of Usurpers, then all the Prelates that conformed not in the times of the late Usurpation were Schismatical separatists by your definition: But to do them right, few of my acquaintance that could by conformity stay in, did then refuse conformity: I hear that you were then no separatist. But Bishop *Gunning*, Dr. *Wild*, Dr. *Hide* and a great many more, took another course; and will not thank you if you stigmatize them with us. But if it be not the Laws of Usurpers in the Roman Empire by your measure; How few were the Emperours that came not in by meer conquest, or by killing, putting out the eyes, or ejecting

ing

ing their predeceſſors, or without any juſtifiable right? And what a caſe *Rome*, *Italy*, *Spain* and *Africa* were in after the firſt conqueſts of the *Gothes* and *Vandals*, and all the Weſtern Empire in the days of the *Henries*, *Frederick* and many others, while men were fighting for the Empire, and Popes claimed the making and unmaking of them all? And even in *France* ever ſince the days of *Chilperic* for many Ages, eſpecially among the progeny of *Charles* the great, it is not to be hid: This way you deſtroy or confound the Churches.

I cannot imagine what you will reply to this? Unleſs you ſay that, [*it is neither the Title, nor the Orthodoxneſs of Princes, which is neceſſary to make their Lawes the bond of Church unity: but it is the goodneſs of their Laws: at leaſt that they impoſe no ſin upon us*]. *Anſ.* 1. Then if the Uſurpers impoſed no ſin, they were Schiſmaticks that obeyed them not. 2. Let that be the rule: who ſhall be judge whether it be ſin or not? If I be a diſcerner for my ſelf, I have told you how much and great ſin I fear, till you are diſpleaſed with the intimation: And when you have proved all thoſe particulars named, to be no ſins, you have done more then yet is done: And if you think you can or do prove it, muſt none have Chriſtian Communion who think your proof invalid, and that you do it worſe than Biſhop *Taylor* that maintained hurtleſs lying?

§. 56. But the other half of the definition of a ſeparatiſtis [*they adminiſter Sacraments by other Rules and after a different manner than what the Church requireth.*

Anſ. 1. Why will you ſo reproach your Church? we do it by no other rule but the *Scripture*; and doth not the Church require that the Scripture be a Rule? You know *Polydore Virgil* and other Papiſts, ordinarily make the ſignal difference of Proteſtants and Papiſts, that the Proteſtants make the Scripture the only Rule of their Religion: On which ſuppoſition *Francis Peron* formed his act of diſputing againſt them. And are not the Church of *England* Proteſtants? If you add another rule, it followeth not that we have another than you have, though you have another beſides what we have.

2. You ſay [*we deny the fact which is evident to all perſons*] and you ſpeak of me: Is this true? What Sacraments do you mean? I never ordained any: I never confirmed any: I have married very few, if thoſe be Sacraments: I have baptiſed no one theſe twenty years: I gave the Lords ſupper to none for about eighteen years. and rarely ſince as I told you. *But, others do?* *Anſ.* And if they have no better reaſon to juſtifie the forſaking of their Miniſtry than you give, well may they go on to do it.

3. Do you mean here by [*Rulers*] the ſame as before by [*Laws*] or

or what mean you? I suppose it's the Canon and Liturgy that you mean. And if by the [*Church*] you mean any thing but the *King and Parliament* you are unintelligible: For the Church hath but two visible essential parts, the Regent and the *Subject* parts. And of the Regent only the supream is essential, the rest being also subjects, and but Integrals: And it is a [*Requiring*] Church which you mention. And so it seemeth that it is but a *lay Church*: And nothing but a *Christian Kingdom.*

4 I have told you that the *French* and *Dutch* Churches here administer the Sacraments by another rule than your Liturgy, and yet are no Schismaticks.

5. And your rule hath many parts: It requireth Preaching, praying, reading the Psalms and two Chapters, and delivering baptism and the Lords Supper in Christs words, and repeating the Creed, the Lords Prayer and the Decalogue. And all that I do when I officiate for any man (for I have no Church,) and others do it with whom I converse. But if it be omitting *any thing* else in your rule that maketh a separation, what is it? I oft hear Conformists omit divers prayers. I have seen Dr. *Horton* give the Lords Supper, I think, to the greater part that sate. I doubt most Parishes seperate, if every omission make a separatist.

6. But thus far you satisfie me, that you judge all for separatists [that preach without all your Assent, consent, subscriptions, that the Covenant bindeth no man living, no not the Parliament men that took it, to endeavour any alteration of Church Government, that it is not lawful to resist any commissioned by the King, (without exception) and much more such: That all are separatists that administer not Sacraments according to your rule, which pronounceth baptized Infants saved so dying, without excepting *Atheists*, *Infidels*, or any, and this as undoubted and certain by Gods word; which requireth the Minister to refuse Baptism and Christendom, where the dedicating Image of the Cross is not submitted to, when the Parent or adult judge it an unlawful Sacrament: And where Baptism must be denied to all that will not make Godfathers and Godmothers the Sole Covenanting undertakers for their Children, without speaking a Covenanting word themselves: And when your rule requireth all Ministers to deny Sacramental Communion to all that scruple kneeling in the reception, and yet excommunicateth them and ruineth them for not Communicating when they are rejected: And also *ipso facto* Excommunicate: To omit much more such, this is your rule, which he that sweryeth from it, is a separatist.

7. But I had thought that we had not been like those late cavilling Papists that will not distinguish *fundamentals* from any little points, lest it lose them a paultry advantage of abusing men. Doth not every good Law and Rule distinguish between *Essentials*, *Integrals*, *and Accidents*, and make more Accidents than are *Integrals*, *and Integrals*, than are Essentials? And doth your rule do otherwise? If not, tell us what *parts* of your rule are necessary to one, and what to the other, or you say nothing to resolve the case. Is every line and Ceremony Essential to the Church, and to each member? If not, how cometh our omitting a form of Ceremony to cut us off as a separated Church any more than every breach of Law cuts off a man from the Commonwealth?

Yea, if your Church be but a *Christian Kingdome*, do not you cut off all from that Kingdom too, that refuse your Forms or Ceremonies or Subscriptions?

8. But Sir, to be short with you, *I will yet believe that Christ is the Institutor of the* Church; and that he hath himself made Laws which are sufficient to be at least the bond of their unity, yea for more than *Essentials*, even the *Integrals*, and many Accidents; and hath given Laws to regulate all mens Laws that determine of needful undetermined accidents: And that no man should be cut off from the Church or taken as seperated that breaketh no Law of God, yea those that are necessary to Church unity and Communion: And that the grand Schismaticks of the world, are the Engineers that fabricate needless, impossible dividing terms and conditions of unity and Communion.

§. 57. But you tell me that [*we do the same things in the same manner as the separatists*: Ergo *we are disingenuous for denying* your accusation.]

Ans. 1. Judge of the fact by what is said.

2. We do not say, 1. That you are no true Ministers or Churches. 2. Nor that it is unlawful to communicate with you: *Ergo* it is not true that we do the same things.

3. But it is the *External action* [the *whole same*] that maketh a separatist. A Parson in the Ale-house, lost his Common-Prayer book: When he came to Church, he told them his mishap, and only read what was in the Bible, *Query* whether his flock and he were separatists? An old Parson that I was bread under, could scarce see, but could say most of the Prayers without book: He said what he could remember, and got a day Labourer one year, and a Taylor another to read the Chapters: *Query*, Whether we were all separatists?

§ 58. But

§ 58. But you undertake to tell the Reason why I *am unwilling to confess a separation, because we have formerly severely condemned it in others, and yet do the same things for which we charged others as guilty of a sinful separation.*

Answ. If this be not true, it is not well; shew me where, and prove, when I ever condemned any for the same *that I do*, or else take more heed what you write hereafter.

§ 59. *Serm. p.* 33 [For the *Assembly of Divines urged their dissenting Brethren to comply with the Rules of Government, and charged them with Schism, if they did not*, &c.

Answ. 1. It's a foul mistake in matter of Fact, if you think that I *was of that Assembly*, yea, or *any one* of them; or that what they did, I did: or those of my acquaintance did it. And it is not much better to pretend that I or they were in all things of their mind: doth the Assemblies judgement concern me any more than you? Did not you conform to them as much as I did?

2. But what mean you to wrong your Hearers by such gross confusion, to joyn in your Application Dr. *Owen* and *me*, (and Mr. *Corbet* I think) with the Assembly, when it is publickly known that in those matters we were of three several opinions: (And who are they that differ not in as great matters?)

(1) It's known that except seven or eight, the Assembly men were all *Conformists* when they came thither: And either they were *suddenly changed*, or not: if not, they were *Conformists* still, and then no wonder that they were of your mind.

And indeed I know that they were not all of one mind: Most of them were moderate *Conformists* that thought it lawful, but that were much better be without it, than make it a snare to silence Ministers, and divide the Church, and therefore were glad that it was laid by: Such were Mr. *Vines*, Mr. *Burgess*, and, I think, most. Some were for Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s way, that no one form of Church Government was of Christs command, but all left to prudence as civil Government is: Such was Dr. *Edward Reignolds* and some others; some were for the sole Government of the Magistracy, called *Erastians*: Such was Mr. *Thomas Coleman*, and how many more I know not. Many of the Parliament liked these Men best: And these were also for an indifferency of the Clergy form: And when Mr. *Coleman* was chosen to give the Covenant to the house of Lords, they took it on his Exposition, that it meant not the Exclusion of the Primitive Episcopacy: some were more tenacious of the *Primitive Episcopacy*, and about to enter a protestation for it; but that it was declared that *only the* English *form as described in the Concatenation was excluded*: These were Dr. *Cornel. Burges*, the ex-

cellent *Thom. Gataker*, and many more; And some few were for the *Divine right of Presbytery* (and after more:) And the five dissenters and Mr. *Philips* were Independents. But take them as *Conformists*, as *Erastians*, and as Indifferent, and judge whether they were not more of your judgment, then of Dr. *Owen*'s or Mine, and it's no dishonour to you: for I think I have not read of many Assemblies of worthier men since the *Apostles* days: But they were but men.

But if indeed they *were all suddenly changed from Conformity to Presbytery*, when they came to *Westminster*; what a dishonour is such mutability to *Conformists*? And how little hold is there of them; if so many of the best of them will so easily change with the times, What wonder if you shall do so?

2. And as for Dr. *Owen*, he was known to joyn with the Independents: And sure you will not interess him in the Assemblies Judgment.

3. And Mr. *Corbet* and I are of one mind; And I thought that the truth was divided between the three parties, and that all of them wanted necessary skill and diligence for the healing of those divisions and the concord of the faithful: And the event excused me in that censure. And now, is the *Synods* Judgment more ours or yours?

(2.) But either this *Synod* were in the right or not: If not, why then will you follow them, or plead their testimony; If yea, then they did well in being against the Liberty of the *Prelatists* also.

(3.) But is it possible that you can expect that men should believe, that *their Case* and *ours* are the same, or that either *All* must be tolerated or *none* that conform not; and that the bare talking for or against Toleration, without distinguishing the Tolerable from the Intolerable, doth tend to mens Edification? He that will tolerate all, is bad; and he that will tolerate none that differ, is mad. As it's an ill argument, *Vespæ habent favos, & apes habent favos; Ergo vespæ sunt apes:* So it is not a good one to say, *Wasps Nests should be destroyed: Ergo Bee-hives* should be destroyed.

§ 60. *But wherein lay the different Cases?*

Ans. In many things and great, however you untruly make them like.

First the Assembly never endeavoured to turn the Independents out of the Parish Churches, and benefices, nor to silence them, forbidding them publick preaching, as you do us; but only would hinder them from gathering Churches out of other mens Parishes.

2. The Assembly put on the Independants, no Oath, no Declaration, Profession, Subscription, or Covenant as necessary to their Ministry, which both sides confessed not to be lawful; and so would have im-

imposed no positive bond which they scrupled, but only the said Omission of their promiscuous unlimited Church-gathering.

3. They imposed no Liturgy, no one Ceremony, no practice on them, contray to their Consciences.

4. They urged them to declare but what Limits they would allow to their Church-gathering Liberty; that it might not extend to Hereticks and the intolerable, and could not prevail; Judge now whether these Cases are of any kin? Save in the *genus* of not allowing unlimited Toleration, which we hold to as well as they. Grant us leave to Preach in the Publick Churches, and to be capable of guiding reformed Parish Churches, yea, or but to Preach or Officiate Publickly for nothing, though we live on Alms and beg our Bread, and we will thank you: Yea, though you hold us to all the termes and concessions in the Kings Declaration about Ecclesiastical Affairs: And is this like the Case of the Assembly, that never offered either to silence an Independent, or forbid him Parsonages, Lectures, Colledg preferments, or impose on him any one scrupled promise, profession or practice?

And yet I again say, both sides were faultily wanting in the knowledge and use of the terms of Peace.

§ 61. Serm. *p.* 35. [*So that whatever false colours and pretences some men make use of to justifie their present practices, if the judgment of their own Brethren may be taken, 'tis no better than plain and down-right separation.*]

Ans. 1. Were they not as much *your Brethren* as mine, and nearer to your Judgment?

2. Let the Reader judge, whether it be half so great separation or distance, as the *Conformists* have among themselves, while one part say that their Church is but Lay in the Essential Head, and the other half say, *It is Clergy*, and so are really of two Churches: And when one party saith, if the King and the Bishops Command contrary Translations, Versions, Times, Places, Liturgies, and modes of worship, the Bishops are to be obeyed before the King, and the other saith the King is to be obeyed before the Bishops. To omit abundance of greater differences than some would perswade men is between us and them.

§ 62. Serm. [*And I must needs say, I never saw any Cause more weakly defended, no not that of Polygamy and Anabaptisme, than that of those who allow it to be Lawful to joyn in Communion with us, and yet go about to vindicate the separate Meetings among us from the guilt of a sinful Separation.*]

Ans. 1. I have long observed, when some men pass a sentence on

others, and call them by reproachful names, it ordinarily more truly sheweth what the *speaker is*, than what the Person or Cause is that he speaks of: For it is so natural for the streams to be like the Spring, and the fruit like the Tree, and the mouth to speak from the abundance of the heart, that one may much conjecture what the *Speaker is* by his words: But what the Cause and Man is that he speaketh of, you can little know, while the speaker oft little knoweth it himself, or would not have another know it. Neither your confidence nor mine will determine a wise Reader.

§ 63. To *pag.* 36 . I Answer, 1. Your Text is so clear and full a Confutation of your Sermon, that it's hard to know how a mind not strongly prejudiced could have preached such a Sermon, or pleaded for the silencing of so many such Ministers from such a text; Yea or can need any more to confute you than to read your Text: 1. It is supposed that it was All that had attained to the truth of Christianity that must walk by the same rule. 2. It was a Divine Rule then known. 3. They were to bear with each other in loving Communion while they grew up to more. If this condemn not *making and imposing* new humane unnecessary Rules, containing that which multitudes of impartial Conscionable men as wise as their Reproaches cannot excuse from such heynous sin, and silencing and excommunicating all that obey them not, and when they forbid them Communion, call them Separatists; I do despair of understanding sence.

And to pag. 37. We come as near you as we can in Conscience; and we know our own Consciences better than you do. But whether you condemn not your selves as Separatists in denying communion where we preach as if you only were the Church, and any that want but your Liturgy were none. Yea when we had the License of the King; unbyassed men will be able to discern.

§ 64. Serm. pag. 37. [*But why then is this kept as such a mighty secret in the Breasts of their Teachers? Why do they not Preach it to them in their Congregations? Is it for fear they should have none left to Preach to? That is not to be imagined of Mortified and Conscientious men: Is it lest they should seem to condemn themselves while they Preach against Separation in a Separate Congregation? This, I confess, looks odly; and the tenderness of a mans mind in such a Case, may out of meer shamefacedness keep him from declaring a truth which flies in his face while he speaks it.*]

Ans. 1. Alas, you shew us, that some men perceive not when it flyeth in their faces. [Reader, hence take heed of Believing words of Reproach against Adversaries, when Interest and Sideing hath made men partial. Would you think that all this *intimated silence* were

were an untruth against *publick Testimony.*

1. I have many and many times declared in print what he intimateth that we dare not Preach. And is not *Printing* a far more Publick declaration, than speaking it in one Room?

2. When I begin to Preach at St. *James*'s, I read a Profession to the Congregation openly, that I preacht not there as to a separate Church, but as in concord with all Christs Church on Earth, for the necessity of the People that had not many of them heard a Sermon many a year, the Parish having 40000 if not 60000 Souls more than could hear in the Parish Church.

3. I built a Chappel by money partly begg'd, and partly to my greater loss than I will mention, that I might but have helpt those needy Souls for nothing: For the second Sermon, one that Preacht for me (that had suffered imprisonment for the Kings Cause) was sent to Gaol, to my great Trouble and Charge. And when I might not use it (said One in Power *Though you would use the Common Prayer there*) I gave up to the use of the Parish, and take it thankfully of Dr. *Loyd* that he will there teach his People.

4. I have many and many a time in the Pulpit openly Preacht against Seperation, even what he now desireth.

5. Not past a Fortnight before his Sermon, I Preacht near him (at the Verge of his Parish in my Lecture) two whole Sermons of it, on *Luk.* 15. the Case of the two Sons; shewing that there are three notable sorts of Separation. 1. The *Persecutors* that forcibly scatter the Flock, as the Papists by dividing, sinful impositions. 2. The *Prophane Separatist* like the Prodigal, who had rather be at the Tavern, the Play-house, the Whore-house, *&c.* than at Church. 3. The *passionate peevish honest Christian*, as in the Text, [*He was hungry and would not come in.*] Here I shewed by many reasons, how faulty and hurtful this mistaking passionate Separation is: And I took that occasion to give them many *Reasons why I communicate with the Parish Church my self, and Separate not from them*; and I told them my judgment, that they that *suffer meerly for not-hearing, or not-communicating thrice a year* as the Law requireth, cannot justifie their Cause without some extraordinary reason, if they live in a Parish that hath a Minister capable of that Office. But I did not malignantly equal the Son that had long *served his Father, and not transgressed his Commandment*, with his Brother in his Prodigal desertion of his Father: But on the next words [*His Father went out to him and intreated him to come in*;] I shewed that Gods Condescention, and Method in satisfying his mistaken passionate Children, should direct Ministers and others how they also should deal with such. And that violence instead of loving Condescension

descension, reasoning and necessary forbearance of such infirmities, sheweth, 1. That such consider not the corruption of Humane Nature, and how bad all men are. 2. They know not what need of Forbearance they have themselves; nor how liable they are to *Error* and to Sin. 3. They imitate not God our Father and Saviour, and know not what manner of Spirit they are of. 4. They have not due acquaintance with the preciousness of Gods Grace and Image, that cannot perceive it, if there be but such an Error or Passion to obscure it. 5. They consider not that they also may be Tempted, and what Temptation may do even with upright Souls. 6. They are strangers to the Pastoral office; They should excel in Love and Tenderness as much as in Knowledge, and as mothers quiet crying Children, and not therefore cast them out of doors. 7. They Cross the ends of the Ministry, if they take the Converting of Souls to be any of its end: For as Generation so Regeneration maketh *Infants* and *Children* before they are grown Men; and Children will be weak and troublesome: And he that would have no such Children, must not endeavour mens Conversion. 8. Yea, they greatly increase the Disease which they would cure: Men will not love those that hurt them so easily as others: And when they are displeased with you, they are the hardlier pleased with your Doctrine. 9. Driving men into the Church, maketh it like a Prison and corrupteth it as compосed of involuntary Members. 10. Yea, they must destroy the Church, if they will suffer none in it that have as great weaknesses as these. Thus I declared both the evil of passionate Seperation, and of mistaking the way of Cure. I would repeat the Sermons, were it not for fear of being tedious.

6. I have Printed in my second *Plea for Peace*, what our *Non-conformity is not*, containing as much in this point as he can reasonably desire, as it was approved by many others, (named in our Judgment about the Interest of Reason in Religion) so that he cannot say that I speak but of my self.

7. I suppose he believeth that I am acquainted with more Non-conformable Ministers than he is (or else he will not think that I am any such *Antesignanus* as Bishop *Morley* calleth me:) And I meet with few or none that contradict what in this case of Separation I have Published; They are commonly for Reformed Parish Churches (not taking all in the Parish for the Church, but bounding Churches in Parishes for Order;) and Preach elsewhere but on necessity and as Assistants and not as Adversaries.

8. Doth not our Practice (who go to the Parish Churches) shew our Judgments to the People if we said nothing?

9. I

9. I could not have drawn the People so much from too great distance if I had not preached to them. At *Acton* I constantly heard Dr. *Rieves*, and his Curate, and I preached only in my house between his Sermons, and then led the People to the Church, which Judge *Hales* my neighbour thought was good service to the Church. And the very Sermon that *I* was sent to the Common Gaol for, was on *Matth.* 5. *Blessed are the meek*, perswading to submissive peace and patience.

10. When Bishop *Morley* forbad me to preach in his Dioceſs, and I could not get leave at my departure to Preach to my hearers one farewel Sermon in publick; I Preacht in a private House to them on *David*'s words [*Bring back the Ark of God into the City, if I have found favour*, &c.] purposely to perswade them as my last advice, not to depart from the publick Parish Assembly, though the Liturgy be there the publick worship. But if the Minister that is there should be intolerable. 1. As utterly unable. 2. Or a Heretick. 3. Or so malignant an Enemy of Godliness as to do more hurt than good; I advised them not to own any such Minister, nor encourage him in his Usurpation. And it was on that account that they long forbore, till the *Vicar* was dead and a better succeeded him.

11. Since then I have written to my old Flock, to perswade them to joyn in the Parish Assembly, and I hear not of three that do refuse it And all this I have said as to that matter of fact, to shew you how farr to believe this Reverend Doctor's intimated ironical accusation.

If he say, that *Other Preachers do not so.*

I Answer First, How knoweth he the Negative that never heareth them, but like a separatist avoideth it as unlawful?

2. Is it not likely that in season they preach *their judgment*?

3. But I confess they may find more profitable work than to preach over all the suspected passages in the *Liturgy*, and other parts of Conformity, and answer all the Peoples objections against them. The Builders and Owners of the houses are the fittest to do such offices to maintain it.

§. 65. *Is it that they fear the Reproaches of the People; which some few of the most eminent Persons among them, have found they must undergo if they touch upon this subject?*

Ans. 1. So farr as your accusation is untrue as to the fact, it's but a further ill intimation to ask, why they *do not* that which *they do?*

2. If they that should better know what their auditors most need, must preach what you appoint that know them less, you may make their Sermons for them as well as their prayers.

3. Those few Persons it seems at least *toucht* on what you say they preacht not: And for my part, whom I know you mean for one, I never

felt my self much tempted to grudge at the Dissenters that therefore will not hear me: If they hear others more suitable to them by whom they can more profit, as more esteeming them, what hurt is that to me? Would *I* have none taught the knowledg of Christ, but by my self? While we have all one Faith, it's some convenience for men to assemble and hear, where they do it with unprejudiced, undisturbed minds.

4. *If* those persons you mention have before and since such censures as you intimate, done what you would perswade men that they do not, your self-contradiction is most palpable.

§. 66. *Serm.* [*For I know not how it cometh to pass that the most Godly people among them, can least endure to be told of their faults.*]

Ans. 1. Did you not intend [*the Most Godly*] for a scorn, you would confess it false.

2 *If* you mean those that we *esteem most Godly*, it is not true neither.

3. *If* you mean those that think themselves so, it's no wonder if they mistake; if not, it's not true.

2. *I* pray you take warning by them, or by your own reproof, and do not now shew that you are one of the *most Godly* by *less enduring* to be told of your faults. *If* otherwise, you have fore-condemned your own impatience.

3. Verily they have dealt much more patiently with me than the Bishops and Canoneers have done: Though some have spoken their dislike of me, none of them (even when they were in power) did ever silence or imprison me, nor ever forbid me to Preach (save once at an Assizes.) How can you think that we can feel their censures, when we have so much worse to feel from the Canoneers? And when you ask, [*Is it for fear they should have none left to preach to?*] *If* you separated not from us, you would see that such have some left still.

§. 67. Serm. p. 42. [*Whence we see the Church of* Englands *endeavour after Uniformity, is acquitted from Tyranny over the Consciences of men, by the Judgment of the most Learned of the Assembly,* &c.]

Ans. 1. Of the Assembly *I* have said enough.

2. *If* you think the Assembles *Uniformity*, or their endeavours for it, were the same with the Church of *Englands*, none that know the case will be of your mind.

3. *If* you are intelligible we must suppose that you cite them to defend this as the conclusion which you own. The word [*Tyranny*] is too harsh to be used without need: But *I* suppose you include that the said *Endeavours* for *Uniformity* have no culpable severity in them.

That is, that the Acts for *Uniformity*, the Canons, the executing of

of them in Declarations, Subscriptions, Oaths, Practices, Punishments Corporal and Spiritual; are no Sin, but Lawful. In your Epistle you say *They* are ill men that say This is *stirring* up to persecution: All that *I* will say is, that if you own these *Endeavours* for *Uniformity*, *I* do not: and the judge is at the door.

§. 68. Serm. p. 44. [*If they form their judgments rather* by *prejudice and passion* and *interest*, *than from the Laws of God, or just Rules of Conscience*, &c.

Ans. 1. This is true and good: *If* we make not Gods Laws the Rule of Conscience, no wonder if we err: God preserve us from all corrupting prejudice, passion, interest and Canons.

2. But when you compare our temptation from *interest* with yours, *I* hope you will not say as Dr. *Ashton*, that *as going to the Bar of God he undertakes to make good, that it's through Pride* and *Covetousness that we conform not*; that is, that we choose the contempt of high and low, and to live on Alms, and multitudes in pinching poverty.

§. 69. Serm. p. 46. [*We find Uniformity and Order condemned as Tyrannical, till men come into power themselves; and then the very same things and arguments are used and thought very good and substantial, which before were weak and sophistical.*]

Ans. A true and sad confession; when *I* read your *Irenicon* and this Sermon, I the more believe you: Therefore it hath been my happiness that I was never in Power, no nor ever on the uppermost side unless as I am for the King. I remember Dr. *Rieves* told us in the Pulpit that the reason why we were against Diocesan Bishops, was because we could not be Bishops our selves: And many others have said the like.

§. 70. Serm. [*Those that now plead for Toleration, did once think it the Mother of Confusion, the nurse of Atheism*, &c.]

Ans. 1. Sure though you often cite Dr. *Owen*, you mean not the Independents.

2. *If* they spake either for or against Toleration as you do without distinction, and were *for all* or *against all*, and distinguished not the *tolerable* from the *intolerable*, it's no great heed to be taken what they say. *If* there were but one false word imposed on you, which you could not assent to, and on 2000 such as you, should *you* be no more tolerated than a *Mahometan*?

§. 71. As to your advice to us p. 47. 48. 1. Did you think that because we must *bear with much that is amiss* in the Church, that therefore we must either *consent* to it, or practise it, and Covenant against all endeavours of amending it, or prefer it before better.

The man you talk of out of Mr. *Ball*, was near *Bremicham*, and was Melancholy to a kind of madness.

To your second I answer, It followeth not, that because we must not judge too hardly of Impositions, therefore we must *say, swear and do* all that is now imposed on us Or that he that dares not do it, is unpeaceable. *I* would we knew in what cases only you would deny Obedience and Conformity your self. Doubtful passages and undoubted evils somewhat differ. A *fault-finding disposition*, and the *Roman* art that *Boccaline* mentions, to swallow a Pumpion, have a mean between them. *Papists*, *Socinians* or any that are uppermost, may call for Conformity under the names of Unity and Peace.

To the Third, *separation* was not the same thing in the mouth of the old *Non-conformists* as in your: They took it first for unchurching the Parish Churches. 2. Or holding it a sin to communicate with them, if they might be excused as to Kneeling, Crossing, *&c.* You take it for [*preaching when forbidden.*] *I* have named to you the old *Non-Conformists* that preached when they could. And half of them *I* think got into small priviledged places, exempt from the Bishops power, and there preached most of them without the Liturgy, and all without the Ceremonies: And was not this against Law? Sure Bishop *Bancroft* that describeth their attempts to set up new Churches and Discipline was not of your mind concerning the *Non-Conformists* judgment. We had but two in all *Shropshire*, and Dr. *Allestree* when a boy, was the Catechiz'd Auditor of one of them, being his next Neighbour (in a peculiar Chapel, without the Liturgy, *&c.*) And yet *I* think not that his Father and all that Assembly were separatists for hearing him. *Bradshaw* thought we should submit to a silencing Law, where our Ministry was unnecessary, and so do I. Dr. *Gouge* was a *Conformist* when he wrote the Book which you cite.

To your Fourth; Wo to them that believe our divisions indanger the Land and let in Popery, and yet will cause them, and no intreaty can procure them to forbear dividing us, when they may; and then revile them that have no way to remedy it, unless wilful heinous sinning be the way.

§. 72 That it is diseases (that love not their own names) in mens hearts, that make the trouble more than our different judgments and Assemblings, experience telleth us: *I* was never a settled Teacher, but in two places (saving a Lecture at *Coventry* in the War,) *viz.* An Assistant at *Budgnorth*, and a Pastor at *Kidderminster*: And in both places there is an honest Conformable and a Non-Conformable Minister: And the People go to the publick Assembly, and many hear the Non-conformist privately between the publick Meetings: And both parties

parties (as *I* hear) live in very much love and peace, and why might it not be so in other places, if there were the like Ministers and People, without all this envious clamour and bugbear words of (*Antichristian*) on one side, or (*Separatists and Schismaticks on the other.*

§ 73. As to your next advices p. 53, 54. First *Qui monet ut facias, &c.* We speak so much against rash ignorant Zeal, that you commend us against your purpose.

2. We thank you for the admonition [*not to be always complaining of hardships and persecutions.*] Doubtless our mercies are so great as forbid us to be over querulous; nay leave us unexcusable, if we are not very thankful. For my own part my sufferings have been very small from man, in comparison of what *I* endure in Soul and Body from my self. They are few days in which *I* am not a heavier burden to my self, than all my Enemies are. But First, *I* may not be senceless of the case of many better men, who have great families and no bread but what they have by Alms in poor Countreys where the people are fitter to receive than to give. And if they remove to bigger Towns the Clergy tell them it is for gain, and they that have one, two, three or more preferments, reproach them as covetous that will rather beg than sin or famish, yet your Mr. *Hickeringil* on the contrary proclaimeth *how little they get*: Were it my case as it is very many *Non-Conformists*, to be in other mens debts, and have nothing to pay house rent, for cloaths, for bread, *&c.* and to have a Wife and many Children to pacifie, and to live on bread and water, or little more, and be offered plenty if *I* would but do that which *I* take to be the hazard of my Soul, *I* should be sensible of the Temptation.

2. And alas all this is nothing to the suffering of thousands of Souls to perish for lack of knowledge, whose case it is lawful to compassionate and lament.

3. And nature maketh it lawful to feel when one is hurt, and to confess that feeling.

4. And methinks if *Julian* that abuseth the Christians should say, your *Master bid you turn the other Cheek*, his scorn would but aggravate his Sin: Patience is our duty; But if they call us to it who Preach and Print, and call out for the Execution of the Laws against us (as many of the most eminent of the Clergy have long done) as you said in another case, *It will look but odly*: To preach to the Parliament, to put Fire to the Faggot, to accuse the King for his Licences and Clemency, to tell the Magistrates and the World, that our Schisms are because they execute not the Laws, even the Laws that fine us forty pound a Sermon, and lay us in the Common Gaol with Malefactors,

and baniſh us from Cities and Corporations, *I* ſay for theſe men to ſay [*complain not*,] is a ſmart accuſation of themſelves. For from good men good is to be expected; but if *I* meet with Gentlemen on the Road that take away my Mony, clothes and horſe, and wound me, and tell me how much *I* am beholden to them, becauſe they did not cut my throat, it's lawful to know what they are, though *I* muſt be patient. And *I* told you before, when you talk of *being made a Sacrifice*, if a few deſpiſed men cenſure you, while you have all your Honour, Reputation, Riches and many preferments to arm you againſt their thoughts and breath, methinks ſheweth that this Counſel is as ſeaſonable to your ſelf as to the ſuffering *Non-conformiſts*.

§. 74. Serm. 54. [*Where are the Priſcillians that have been put to death by their inſtigation? What do ſuch inſinuations mean, but that our Biſhops are the followers of* Ithacius *and* Idacius *in their cruelty; and they of the good and meek Biſhop St.* Martin, *who refuſed communion with them on that account? If men entertain ſuch kind thoughts of themſelves, and ſuch hard thoughts of their Superiours, whatever they plead for, they have no inclination to Peace.*]

Anſwer 1. That is, to your Terms of Peace, and you being Judge. 2. Knowledg is oft conſtrained: *It* is no ſin to know Hiſtory, much leſs Publick matter of preſent fact, and leaſt of all, that which we ſee and feel. *Is* it a ſin to know when a man is in priſon, or when his goods or books are diſtrained, *&c*? *I* the rather ſpeak to this, becauſe a Reverend Biſhop tells me alſo of this wrong, as if thoſe Biſhops caſe were unlike to his; and citeth the words of the Hiſtorian that mentioneth the ſuffering of the Churches in *Spain* on that account, as if *Maximus* had but taken advantage of the Biſhops ſpleen to Tyrannize, and prey upon the Churches. *I* deſire not to make any men ſeem worſe then they are, nor cauſeleſly to open the faults of any. I profeſs to the world that it is not in an impatient aggravating of any ſufferings of my own (which are ſmall,) that *I* write this, but as the true ſtating of the caſe between us. *If* the matter of fact be not truly ſtated, the matter of *right* cannot be well determined. *I* hate falſe Hiſtory.

1. *It* is agreed on by many of the beſt Hiſtorians of that Age, beſide *Beda*, that *Maximus* wanted nothing but a good Title to make him one of the beſt of *Emperours*: That he was ſaid to be made Emperour by the *Britiſh* Souldiers, againſt his will, and being once in, could not go back. His uſurpation was wicked, but a way too common in the Empire. He was of a pious life, and great zeal for the Biſhops and the Orthodox Religion; what he did was to pleaſe the Biſhops and to ſuppreſs Hereſie and Schiſme: And it's like enough he thought by their friendſhip to ſtrengthen himſelf. He reſcued *Ambroſe*

broſe at *Milan* from the *Arrians*, and by his threats deterred *Valentinian* (provoked by his Wife) from perſecuting him, and ſo preſerved the Church of *Milan* and many others.

2. I read not of any of the Biſhops in all his Countreys that complyed not with this Uſurper, ſave *Martin*, *Theognoſtus*, and *Ambroſe*, (that was preſerved by him.)

3. It was not *Ithaicus* and *Idacius* only, but all the Synod of the Biſhops, that were guilty, and that *Martin* ſeparated from.

4. The *Priſcillians* were down-right *Gnoſticks*, and ſo are not the Nonconformiſts, who you ſay agree with you in Doctrine, *&c.*

5. It is but the death of *Priſcillian* and a very few more that the Biſhops were ſaid to have procured; and they were aſhamed of it when they had done, and denyed that it was their doing. You force me for Hiſtorical Verity to tell you, that they did not ſilence about 2000 Miniſters, which is worſe than many bodily afflictions; nor did they deſire *Maximus* to make a Law that all that did not ſuch things *as* ours, ſhould be ruined by Fines, Impriſoned, *&c.* Make them not worſe than they were. Our Quakers are much like the *Priſcillianiſts*. Had it been but twice as *many of them* that had dyed in priſon, as were put to death of the *Priſcillianiſts*, the caſes had not been much unlike. But Mr. *Thomſon* that dyed in Priſon at *Briſtol*, Mr. *Field* that dyed in Priſon here; Mr. *Hughes* that in Priſon catcht his mortal ſickneſs; Mr. *Joſeph Allen* that had the ſame Lot, and many more ſuch, were none of them like the *Priſcillianiſts*; but men of whom *I* and ſuch as *I* come far ſhort.

6. The great miſchief that thoſe Biſhops did was by ſuſpecting men that *Faſted* and *Prayed* much, to be *Priſcillians*; they brought reproach by unjuſt ſuſpicions in all Countrys on the moſt ſtrict Religious men; and *Martin* was called by them a *Priſcillianiſt* for being againſt the Biſhops Perſecution of them. Let not me, but publick knowledge here make the compariſon: How ſmall was this reproach, for extent and continuance, in compariſon of that which by occaſion of Non-conformity hath been caſt on men in *England*? My memory ſerveth me from 1623 or 24; Commonly in the Countreys, if a man did but pray in his family, and ſpend the Lords day in Religious Exerciſes, reading the Scripture, or repeating a Sermon, or reading a good book, or ſinging a Pſalm, and was againſt ſwearing and drunkenneſs, he was made the common ſcorn, as a *Puritane*; and the Biſhops Articles, and their reproach of Non-conformiſts, occaſioned all this in the Rabble againſt thoſe that were no Non-conformiſts. *If* you believe not me, believe a Conformiſt *Robert Bolton*, that ſaith more of the horrid abuſe of Piety by the name of *Puritane*. And ſince then the ſame ſpirit hath uſed the *Name* of *Preſbyterian*,

byterian, Schismatick, Separatist, Fanatick, to the like reproach of seriousness and diligence in Religion, though not so universally as the name *Puritan* was; Yea if a man had but been for Lectures, and such like helps as Arch-Bishop *Grindall* was for (to his cost) or for afternoon Sermons, or would not read the book for Sunday dancing, &c. he was worse than suspected and reproached. My neighbours that *I* once was a Teacher to, did never presume to preach nor invade the ministerial Office, nor do any thing but the work of private Christians, that is to pray, and to repeat the Sermon, and sing a Psalm, but because many ignorant Families that could not read, could not do any of this in their houses, they joyned with the Neighbours that performed it, and this not at time of Publick worship: yet because that more than four such met, they were destrained on and laid in Gaols. Compare all this (and the removal of many hundred families out of the Land heretofore) with the consequents of the Bishops zeal against the *Priscillians.*

But remember that it is not in my thoughts to lay any of this upon the Bishops that came in since the Impositions and actions aforesaid; and had no hand in them, and cry not to Magistrates to execute the Laws, much less on men of such known moderation as divers of them are, nor on the Peaceable Conformists that own none of this.

7. And it must be remembred that *Martin* was but an odd man, and seemed singular against the Synods of all the Bishops, and a man of little Learning, like one of our Trades-men that is Religious. And therefore I have wondred that *Baronius* and *Binnius*, and our *Rich. Hooker*, did so openly decry the faults of the Bishops here, and take part with *Martin*, and not rather turn the reproach on him, as an unlearned Separatist, and Fanatick: But his Miracles silenced all reproaches; with the rooted esteem which serious Christians will still have for serious Piety, when the Reproachers have said and done their worst; Else one unlearned *Man* that went in sordid attire, and lived in a small thatcht Cottage, and lay on the Ground, and eat worse than our beggars do, and pleaded for the *Gnosticks* persons, was liker to have been born down as a mad Fanatick, than such men as Dr. *Twisse*, *Thomas Gataker*, *Richard Vines*, *Anthony Burges*, Mr. *Hughes*, *Joseph Allen*, and about 2000 more.

8. Lastly, Let it be noted that the Cause of St. *Martin* was his *judgement that Heresie and Schism*, even as bad as the *Gnosticks* was not to be *punished by the sword*, but only by Church censures; and therefore that the Bishops did wickedly, in calling for the Magistrates sword against them for then if the Heretick can get the Magistrate to be for him, the same sword may be drawn against the Orthodox: And so the *Priscillianists* once

once got a great Courtier to be for them, and a while turned the sword against their adversaries, which occasioned sufferings in *Spain* and other parts. And I wonder how *Baronius*, *Binnius*, or you that plead for the silencing and other afflicting of Non-conformists, under the name of [*Non-toleration*] and the *Churches endeavours* for *Uniformity* can possibly keep out the light which would tell you that we may give you twenty to one in weighing your case and ours with *Ithacius* and *Martins*, if any impartial hand do hold the ballance. Is not your whole *cause*, who cry out for the execution of the Laws, and against our Toleration, (that is, that we are not to be endured) clean contrary to *Martins* cause?

§. 75. As to your 3d. Advice, *pag.* 55. [*Not to condemn others for that which themselves have practised*]

I *Answer*, 1. Prove that I or any of my Acquaintance ever practised Ejecting, Silencing, Ruining men for things unnecessary, yea, or for greater things. Whom did we ever forbid to Preach the truth? Whom did we cast out of all Church maintenance? Whom did we imprison?

2. If any in *New-England* had done it, is that our doing? They that are against Christs Righteousness imputed, I hope will not joyn with you in imputing to us the sins of those that were no Kin to us, and we never saw.

3. What a pitiful Case is Mankind in, if such an Harangue of confounding words can make them believe, that Tolerating or not-Tolerating in causes vastly different, are the same? Is it all one to deny men Liberty to seduce men from the Essentials of the Faith, and to forbid many hundreds to preach Christs Gospel, unless they will openly profess that they Assent and Consent to three Books, and Covenant never to endeavour the Reforming of the Government of the Church, *&c*? Might not the Papists have said to us just as you do [*it is the same thing* for us to burn Protestants as Hereticks, as for you to expel the Subverters of the Faith.] But you that are for silencing us all, for not consenting to, *You know what*, have less excuse for calling it [*the same thing*] *unless you think Christ and a Liturgy to be same.*

It is therefore fitter to be answered with Compassionate Tears than Words, when you say *pag.* 56. that [*every one of them would practise the same where it in their Power, and think it very justifiable so to do*] *Ans.* O whither may he rowl that is tumbling down the Hill! I was never in Power: The *Independents* once were: They used it not as I would have had them: But did they or the Presbyterians Eject or Silence one another? Is it a good consequence [you would silence a Quaker that denieth the Essentials of Christianity: Ergo, *every one of you, were it in*

Your power, would Silence, Imprison, and Ruine them, that differ from you in Ceremony, Form, or Subscription like ours?] O how incredible are the words of some applauded men!

I remember that at the *Savoy* when it was said how some had used the Episcopal, Bishop *Walton* excused and reproved me, and said, that [*indeed I had then written against Ejecting or Troubling any honest worthy man for being Episcopal or against the Parliament, but that the incompetent and vicious of all sorts equally should be Ejected But* (saith he) *did not you write that if the Sword interposed not, but meer liberty to Volunteers were granted to all parties, the Prelatical Liturgick Church would be like a Tavern or Inne where many sober Persons come, but so many others also, as would make it a place of no very great inviting Fame?*] I confessed the truth, and still confess it.

§. 76. To your 4th. Advice, [*not to make our differences seem greater than they are.*]

I do consent. But 1. Did our 18 or 19 years Silencing them, do that? 2. Do not you do it, that make men believe that we are *Intolerable* and to be Silenced, and that Separate from our Congregations as if it were a sin to join with us? 3. We desire only a true stating of the Case.

The *honest dealing* which you demand, I and many others constantly perform; and it's ill to intimate that we do not. But you add,

§. 77. [*It's hard to understand if occasional Communion be lawful, that constant Communion should not be a Duty.*]

Ans. Some Truths are hard to men of great Wit. It's lawful to have communion in our Assemblies (as I am ready to prove) and yet you think not *any*, much less *constant*, Communion to be a Duty. It's lawful to have Communion with the *French*, *Dutch*, or *Greek* Church; must constant Communion be therefore a Duty? It's lawful to have Communion with an ignorant Reader, or a drunken Priest (at least in your Judgment;) Is it therefore a duty to seek no better?

§. 78. Serm. [*All understanding men will conclude that they prefer some little interests of their own, before the Honour of Christ and the Peace of the Church.*]

Ans. 1. The word [*Little*] came well in as to your sense: Truly *Poverty and Ruin* are little interests: I cannot imagine what you mean, unless it be *Reputation.* But is not your Reputation with the *Highest Persons,* and the multitude, a more tempting Interest than our Reputation with such as you much Contemn. 2. But do you understanding men know our hearts better than we? And are you sure that none are *understanding* that be not as partially Censorious as you? If we prefer our Little interest, why do we not Conform? If you take us all for Mad men, dispute not with us: if not, can we be ignorant that

Carnal

Carnal Interest is on your side, and are none of us Capable of it? 3. I should have taken it as too sharp an intimation to say that *Your Greater Interest sweyeth you*: No man that is a Christian taketh these vain vexatious World for his great Interest. And to make the *Little Interest* of Prosecuted, Beggared, Ruined Non-conformists to be that which beareth down, both all the Interest of Wealth, Ease, and Worldly honours and the interest of the Churches Peace and the interest of their own Salvation, and all this by no other proof than a Supposition that your sagacity knoweth their hearts, and that all understanding men are of your mind] the naughtiness of this is so great that it will not suffer you to see it. Sir, as wise as you are, I know my own heart better than you do (and so do my Brethren know theirs.) If you would swear the contrary, I will not believe you. And I tell you, it is *no Little Interest* that moveth me; it is greater than a Deanery or a Bishoprick. I were worse than mad, if I. I consumed my small estate. 2. And my Health. 3. And denied my Ease. 4. And all wordly Wealth and Pleasure. 5. And exposed my self to be called a Schismatick and a Rogue, by the Conformists. 6. And lay my self under the ruining dangers of the Law. And 7. to be written against as doing all this by sin. 8. And all this under the languishings and pains of sickness, expecting when I am called to my account; I say I were worse than mad, if I chose all this for that which you call [*Little Interest.*] 9. And if *Reputation* with my poor despised party be that *Little interest*, you confute your self before, where you say how much I have undergone of their impatient Censures. Have I flattered them? Have I not said more against their faults than you have done, though not against their Duty? 10. Some of my heart-judges say, it is a *semel dixisse*, to avoid the imputation of mutability. But their Companions confute them who charge me with my retractions; who see by my writings that I left room for second thoughts, and have not silenced them to escape the Censure of any whomsoever. I have left my Reputation to God, and never was so thin Skin'd as to be unable to bear a Cholerick breath: I live not upon Air, or the thoughts of men, who will shortly with me be silent in the dust. They that know how many Books, perhaps scores, have been written against me, by Sectaries of many sorts, and some by good and sober men, Presbyterians, Independants and Prelatical, and how little they have broke my peace, will not think *applause* is my *Little Interest* Had *I* been as you, *I* would have left out this Charge of *Little Interest*, lest it should tempt men to compare your Case and ours.

§. 79. Your 5th. Advice is just: I hate Charging you or any with unjust suspicious of inclinations to Popery. *I* know some few men whom

whom *I* have reason to say, Defend *Grotius* as one of their Religion; who thought that the Protestants can never unite among themselves till they unite with *Rome* as the Mistress Church; and that the Councils even that of *Trent* are sound in the Faith, and that securing the rights of Kings and Bishops, and disowning the Schoolmens abuses and the Clergies evil lives, and reducing the Pope to rule us, not Arbitrarily but by the Canons, are enough to satisfie and reconcile us. But to charge this on all, or most, is unjust: We know what Bishop *Barlow*, Bishop *Crofts* and divers others have done to signifie their Faithfulness to the Protestant Cause. And if *Contzen*'s way prevail not, to drill men they know not whither by degrees, I hope of the 9000 or 10000 Clergie men in *England*, one thousand will not turn to Popery. But I must say, that when some Prelates made it their great business to Silence, Shame and Ruin us, and drive us far enough from Persons of Power, undertaking to preserve the Protestant Religion better without us than with us, and after all, cry out themselves that we are in danger of Popery by their own Pupils and Disciples, whose instruction they undertook; men will have leave to think of this awake, and to judge of Causes by Effects.

§. 80. Your Counsel is good, [*Not to run the hazard of all for a show of greater Liberty to our selves.*] Should *I* tell you three stories of our hazarding our own Liberties because we would not do what you disswade us from, one in 1660, and another 1662, and another about 1667, it would be a pair of Spectacles to some. 2. But will not all that have eyes see, who doth more for Toleration of *Popery*, they that say [*Popery and you shall stand and fall together, except you will say, subscribe and do all that is prescribed you*;] or they that say [*We cannot do that which we take to be hainous sin?*] Do you think the Papists had not rather (with you) that you were silenced, than that we Preach, who have been their greatest Adversaries? If you will rather let in Toleration of Popery, than you will Tolerate Protestants that fear the guilt of Lying, Perjury, and many other Evils, should they do that which you Confess *indifferent*, let God be judge between you and us.

FINIS.

of Tanquin & Japan by Edward
all of Tabarnier
Lingua is this Lingua in Thrift
of the learned, as Latin amongst us
with or and thoo our in Tanquin
the adjacent country & the people
and more howsoever to the eastward a small
Tabarnier confined to the eastward a small
rock a pair of small pistolls & two pictures
of Turkeys, wch obliged the eastward, the
presented the K with a noble present, the
Chinese hilt enchased wth Rubies & Emeralds
& pistols inlaid wth silver & Japan
& Chinese embroidered wth gold & silk
& the pictures of Turkeys. 3.
Tanquin was a K of China, & now governed
altogether by Barbarians. But now the
inhabitants seller therefore desire to trade. 2
it hath many Rivers & Rain in season &
makes it very pleasant & fruitfull. 3
on the east it borders upon China, on
the south on Cochinchina. 4
the winter have frost nor snow. 5.
Deep Seas, stormy & not known their
ebbs & flows from the north & south
& from the
sea: into, rebounds. & from the
shore — from shore: north, & so all, ma
shore — the Winters East north
& stormy — & — the Winters East north
& trained, yet towards — towards
they have (as in the rest of the Indies)
their seasons, tempests & hurricanes
& thunders & lightnings & the rocks, yet
& they have — that from 24 hours 6.
& they have 12 months of sea, they rise
& fall their height. 6.

Tunquin is almost as big as ffrance & hath
above 20000 ritys & townes & beside
the greatest pt of their Rivers are
wd wth boats, wch serve them in stead
of horses & are long neat, tho they poop
& prow alike. 6.
they have neither Corn nor wine, but are
fruitfull & plenty of rice. 7
they make Drinke of Rice & have good
ale. like or strong waters. 7
the Palm tree grows their in Abundance &
hath a nut as big, & the kernell within it
as good as Coco nut, tasting like almonds. 7
& many other pleasant fruits not in Europe. 8
their are trees like Canes or reeds wch grow
not in the ground & spread far, 300 pace. 8
a bird like a swallow builds a nest, wch proves
a rare Medicine for all wounds, holding
the taste of all sweet spices together.
their are many tortoises. 9 wch yeild
they pickle up & have quantities of tortoises. 10
they have abundance of oranges, naranges, citrons
the figure of their citrons is so strange, it cannot
be described. but they whiten their teeth, & prevent
stones in the bladder, & cleanse & open
& heal as well as we do wth agrimony & gold. 10
Dutch carry much silk from Tonquin to Japon in
both wch & poor in Tunquin weave silk grounds
they sell much sugar but cannot find it. 10
there are no Lions, Asses nor sheep. but many
Goates, Horses, Hogs & Buffes,
turkeys. Tigers, Harts & Apes, & Elephants.
strange they are troubled wth Rats & mice &
have no cats, they train up dogs, wch watch
& kill them. but gnats & flies & musketos are
very troublesome & numerous. Europeans
will shed there a cake of silk in a night. 11.

the Gocats will raise Fleetes in severall ffleets, &
it soon falls [illegible] wrought in rold water. 11.
their growes Lignum aloes, some worth 1000 ro
[illegible] other thirst rowres a pound. 13
they have no coyn (except Spanish Reals) but pay
oddes of gold or silver by weight. 14.
for in Spanish Reals
[illegible] silver is brought from China & Ja
& silver is brought from [illegible]
& Ilde of vast quantityes of fish wch are
in Ilde of Vast quantityes of fish wch are
out of Tunquin. wch wth sought & lignum aloes are t
their riches of the Kingdom. 14.

---

when the K. goes out of his palace he is carryed by
chief officers of his household in his Palinquin or chai
& mussicians & trumpeters follow his chair: after the
an officer carryes a Bason full of water or silver wat
& on it floats a Reed boat, wch a hole in the bottom, w
earthy in an hower fills wth water, & then sinks to bo
then two other officers strike the hower upon two gon
Reeds (Feathers) like our Running Flaggs, & goe
Lieutenant: it fill wth all & give a great sound.
then he bids the rest to float again. & so is their way
worken the hours, all the Judges about the Kings are up
=Lords in the waiting season, the ayre being so damp tha
of all from & that wch, should any possibility to p
them without Lignum aloes. the further eastward t
Calon those raines begin. All sorts of quality Ro
8. offices to attend the Engine at their palace. Gold, wh
is ordinarily kept, & those eight also keepe the Pallace gat

---

when the Queen goes abroad, five Elephants draw her
season will Lath grate like windowes. & the Queen
rayed rarefolk to keep off the [illegible] for. 15 offic
walke next unto the Kings. &c Ladyes of hon
follow those, who keep her in Coul of the season. &
another troupe rayed & fumes & Robes, another
& another troupe all [illegible] wood & very time
=onds the Queen will drink for those alledge of the sea before t
is about to drink for they alledge of the sea before t
drink, & when the queen gets out of the season [illegible] m
& when the queen gets out of the season [illegible] m
=ies of quality draw her to any place where she
has a mind to goe. But before she appear they all
withdraw, for it's a crime to looke upon her.
An. 1649. the K. of Tunquin had an army of 800 thousa
.94000 foot & 722 elephants. 130 for the warr &
the rest to carry the tents & baggage. & 318 galleys
& Barks long & narrow wth oars & Sailes. the
& Boates
Souldiers.

their lords wife Lords hand. for when they
are not of the guard they are obliged to attend
their Lord where ever they go. if their armes
are not kept bright they loose 8 days wages,
they are to keep the bowes & arrowes two days
a week. & if it rains the best shot hath a month
pay. & if he miss the worst shot, stands centinell
double his time. & when the souldiers are sent
on Board the gallyes, to learn to row, & they
row best are rewarded. their pay is so small
it will not maintaine their families, therefore their
wives of all the meaner sort keep trade & worke
to maintaine their families.

The people are mild & peaceable, & are not furious
at seeking forrain conquests, tending to honor
their ancestors. they have good memories, & are no
way inferior to the Chinoys for learning, & poetry
of an alien tongue is much admired by the white-
=nesse of Europeans. their Emperours wear parti-coloured
hair mixt of blacke & white Chinoys. their
hair is blacke, & they tye it, & plait it in traffs, wch
they tye on the top of their heads, & others tye their
hair about their neckes. all paint their teeth blacke.
both men & women weare long robes downe to their
heels, bound about their middle with a girdle of silk
imbroidered with gold & silver. the Souldiers wear
only coates his knees, & their breeches to their mid-
leg, & about either knee & shoulder. the Emperour
& also the Princes, for they are obliged to every
year to work 3 months for the King & 3 months
for moore, wch are their months, to the maintaining
of a great Lord for no pay. & when the waters are
high & flow over their grounds, after the waters are fall'n downe
their banks like nile. & oft carry away towns.

The Governor, wch is to be obeyed by all the
inhabitants, is chosen by the Emperour, & is
called Tutan. he is to guard the Emperours
person, & to garnish their Lords, wch hang
downe upon their backs, reaching the length to
the Ground. & always when they
go the Ranforeth Chair. & always when they
go abroad. & they have 6 wives. if a man may put away his
wife when he pleases, but the woman has not that priviled-
=ledge, to oblige them to be respectfull to their
husbands. but then the man must restore her portion
& keep her children she had to him.

The people took not their victuals at their meals,
but at two setts dishes, 6 inches long.
If a woman commit adultery she is put to an Elephant
who throwes her up to the air then tramples her to death.
Page 19. the man also is governed by a night